DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 175 EC 115 093

AUTHOR Ross, Catherine J.; And Others
TITLE Conference Recommendations on Child Abuse. Report of Representatives from Government, Media and the Academic Community.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia. Annenberg School of Communications.; Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Abuse; Corporal Punishment; *Definitions; *Legislation; *Mass Media; Policy Formation; *Prevention; Research Needs

ABSTRACT

The report presents recommendations from a November, 1978 national conference on child abuse. It is explained that groups of invited representatives from government, social service and public interest groups, the media, and the academic community discussed policies for treatment and prevention of child abuse. Summarized are recommendations on the following topics (sample recommendations in parentheses): defining child abuse (having separate definitions for legal, clinical, social service and research purposes); socially sanctioned abuse (ending corporal punishment in schools); legislation (developing interdisciplinary panels to review local laws); prevention (requiring parent education in school); the communications industries (increasing the use of public service announcements); research issues (integrating research on child abuse into the mainstream of scholarship in established disciplines); and child abuse and broader issues (working for reforms to provide decent medical care and a baseline standard of living for all families). Appended are group discussion guidelines, a list of conference participants, and a summary of child welfare amendments introduced in Congress. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175175

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS ON CHILD ABUSE

The Report of A National Conference of Representatives from Government, Media, and the Academic Community. The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, and the Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy, Yale University, Box 11A Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520

November 20-21, 1978, Philadelphia, PA

Written and Submitted by:

Catherine J. Ross
Lawrence Aber
Karen Alexander
Kirby A. Heller
Karen Nelson
Deborah Phillips-DeMott

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction: The Process.....1

II. Major Conference Recommendations: A Short List.....3

III. Defining Child Abuse.....5

IV. Socially Sanctioned Abuse.....9

V. The Law: Intervention and Child Abuse.....12

VI. Prevention of Child Abuse and Needed Services.....14

VII. The Communication Industries: Television, Newspapers and Magazines.....21

VIII. Research Issues.....25

IX. Child Abuse and Broader Social Issues.....27

X. Appendix A: Instructions Distributed to Policy Discussion Groups.....30

Appendix B: Conference Registration List.....33

c Copyright 1979

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Catherine J. Ross

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED175093

I. Introduction: The Process

The recommendations that follow are based on presentations and discussion at the national conference on child abuse that took place in Philadelphia November 20-21, 1978. The conference was sponsored jointly by the Annenberg School of Communications of the University of Pennsylvania and the Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy at Yale University. More than 350 invited representatives from government, social service and public interest groups, the media, and the academic community attended.

For part of each conference day, participants were divided into discussion groups to develop better policies for the treatment and prevention of child abuse.[1] A set of questions helped guide each discussion group (see Appendix A). Reporters took minutes at every paper presentation and question period, as well as at the policy discussion groups.[2] After the conference adjourned, a working committee distilled the minutes and additional communications from individual participants in order to prepare the following recommendations.

The constraints of time and setting prevented the conference itself from formally establishing an agenda of priorities for policy. Nonetheless, some areas of consensus emerged, as will be indicated below. The discussions indicated areas of concern which merit further study, and directions in which nearly every conference participant would like to see policy move. The details for accomplishing ends could not be worked out in two days.

---

1. The following persons chaired discussion groups:
   Karen Anderson, Frank G. Bolton, Jr., Richard Byrne, Carolyn Harmon, Jane Knitzer, Michael Lamb, Frank Loda and Robert McCall.

2. The following persons took minutes and prepared interim memos:
   Maurine Ballard, Jan Blacher-Dixon, Michael Arthur Campbell, Deborah Cohn, Jack Daley, Mark Gonzalez, Julia Hall, Heather Harr-Mazar, Kirby Heller, Michael Arthur Hoffman, Mogens Jensen, Sharon Lynn Kagan, Anna Marsh, Victoria Mikow, Susan Muenchow, Suzanne Randolph, Helen Samuels, Geoffrey Stevens, Samuel Streit, Wendy Wintermute and Wendy Wolfenson.

This committee was therefore left with the task of recording, setting priorities for, and evaluating the realism of various proposals.[3] As far as possible this report indicates what this committee believes is clear from the minutes, what questions or conclusions the committee added after working with the material, and some of our own clearly labelled ideas. Because committee members felt our task was both to record and to develop meaningful proposals, we decided to report on divergent opinions that may have been expressed, but also to evaluate ideas and set realistic priorities. We emphasized those ideas that seemed easiest to implement and most cost effective.

The recommendations fall into three broad categories: areas for further investigation or reevaluation; immediate, concrete proposals for immediate action; and broader suggestions for longterm social reform. Each section of the report considers the problems and debates underlying the proposals, indicates whether most conference participants seemed in agreement, and suggests how proposals might be carried out. We believe a wide range of organizations and individuals have roles in solving the problem of child abuse. They include local, state and federal agencies, the media, and many existing community and national resources organized for other purposes. The proposals below suggest some special roles for specific groups, but do not always spell them out. The recommendations are guidelines for action that need further consideration and refinement by individuals and organizations concerned with children. We hope that they will provide the impetus for widespread discussion, study and action.

---

3. The committee members were: Catherine J. Ross, Conference Program Director
Lawrence Aber
Karen Alexander
Kirby A. Heller
Karen Nelson
Deborah Phillips-DeMott

II. Major Conference Recommendations: A Short List

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

1. A first priority is to establish useful definitions of child abuse tailored to how the definitions will be used. A national commission composed of experts from different fields should develop definitions for use in research, legal intervention, and case work. Because we cannot prevent or contain a problem that has not even been defined the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect should spearhead the effort to develop definitions. Consideration should be given to the delicate balance between the rights of children, the family, natural parents and the state. (See pp. 5, 8, 12).

2. The mistreatment of children in public care should be ended. Specifically, corporal punishment in schools should be prohibited by state law; financial sanctions should be imposed on school systems using corporal punishment. The monitoring of children's institutions by parents and concerned citizens should be encouraged and facilitated by the use of panels empowered to receive reports and correct violations. People who staff schools and non-educational institutions should receive ongoing training in the needs of children and in alternatives to corporal punishment. (See pp. 10-11).

3. The principles that led to the establishment of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare should be reaffirmed. The Center appears to be overburdened by a broad charge that is not backed by sufficient funding. It should concentrate on gaining visibility for the problem of abuse, coordinating federal efforts, and helping to provide conceptual and symbolic leadership in spearheading the activities of diverse organizations engaged in trying to prevent abuse. Specific suggestions regarding the National Center are integrated throughout this report.

4. We should develop broad supportive family and child services to help prevent abuse before it occurs. A wide variety of existing public, private and informal services should be enhanced and redirected to include an awareness of child abuse. Public interest organizations should undertake the development of local inventories of services in each community and make them available in a single-door family referral service. (See p. 15).

5. Television, newspapers and magazines should devote more time and space to sophisticated consideration of children's and family issues including child abuse. Public service announcements and more realistic portrayals within standard entertainment are needed. Scholars, concerned citizens and service deliverers should take an active role in sharing information with representatives of the media and with government officials. (See pp. 21-22, 24).

6. Basic research, integrated into the mainstream of scholarship, is needed regarding the causes, impact and prevention of abuse. Evaluations of model service delivery projects should be made compulsory. Both kinds of research will improve services, and should receive funding from the general budget for children's and family services and from a coordinated effort of federal research agencies. (See pp. 25-26).

SUGGESTIONS FOR LONG-TERM ACTION

Although conference participants felt that the specific proposals made above could reduce the incidence of child abuse, only broad social reforms will alleviate the stress that often seems to precipitate it. The United States needs to develop programs for day care, better housing, full employment, medical insurance, coordinated social services, full employment and national policies designed to facilitate family life. In addition, particularly complicated areas of social policy, such as the problem of children in protracted foster care, will require continued scrutiny and overhaul. (See Section IX).

III. Defining Child Abuse

Recommendations

1. Definitions of child abuse should take into account the purpose for which the definition will be used. Separate definitions should be developed for legal, research, social service and clinical purposes.
2. An interdisciplinary national commission to develop and scrutinize definitions should be formed. That panel should include representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union, American Bar Association panel, the medical and service delivery communities, and researchers including experts on classification and labeling. Its efforts could be coordinated by the National Center in HEW.

* * * *

Most participants agreed that current working definitions of child abuse are inadequate, and that it is difficult to develop a single definition of child abuse. No single definition of abuse has succeeded in meeting all of the functions that our society asks it to perform. American society could clearly respond more effectively to the problem of child abuse if we could agree about how to define it. A continuum of definitions exist ranging from the extremely narrow one limited to life threatening physical violence to the broadest view of abuse as including any interference with the optimal development of children. Each definition of abuse must acknowledge the values behind that definition and the purposes for which it will be used. Participants suggested that legal, clinical, social service and research purposes each merit separate working definitions of child abuse. The clarification and standardization of a range of definitions already being used informally would facilitate accurate communication about child abuse among the members of different professions.

Central to determining how inclusive any definition should be is whether or not it will be used to justify coercive intervention in a family.

In exploring the need for new, clearly delineated definitions, some participants suggested that for the purposes of research or the provision of services on a voluntary basis, the definition of child abuse should be broad enough to include neglect and encompass all forms of child maltreatment. This broad definition should be used in efforts to raise public awareness about children's needs and family life. Other participants, however, suggested that a narrower definition should be used for the purposes of legal action and intervention in families. They sought to protect family rights and direct scant resources to the neediest families, and recommended a legal definition of abuse limited to the threat of imminent danger of serious physical harm to a child which would avoid concepts such as neglect or emotional abuse. Distinctions between narrow legal definitions and broader social definitions could be made and clarified through revision of the National Center's requirements governing eligibility for funding.

The distinction between a broad definition for research and a narrow legal definition proved controversial. Some delegates objected to narrowing the legal definition of abuse on the grounds that they did not want to restrict entitlement to services. The label of "abused child" provides a child with immediate access to more state and local programs than any other present designation. Similarly, child abuse programs attract funding to states and localities. On the other hand, participants generally agreed that the term abuse had become so accusatory that it could discourage parents from seeking help. "Child abuse" as a label can be used negatively as a way of indentifying social deviants and justifying inappropriate intervention, and positively as a rallying point for executive and legislative support for funding child welfare services and as a framework for clinical case management and program development and evaluation. Clinical case management and

program development may well merit their own definitions of child abuse/ neglect. Many conference participants believed, and this committee concurs, that the disease model should not dominate the popular definition of child abuse; by emphasizing the "illness" of the abusive adult, a definition tied to disease discourages creative approaches to the problem of abuse. The term "child abuse" should not be used solely for labeling purposes. All definitions of that term should consider the weaknesses of children and adults in the context of their strengths and the setting in which maltreatment occurs so that definitions can lead to a constructive strategy for prevention and help.

Conference participants were strongly divided on several questions that are pivotal to developing a definition. These questions, which need further exploration, included: does neglect have the potential to be as harmful as physical aggression? does child abuse take both physical and psychological forms? if so, how can we develop a fair measure of psychological abuse? are all forms of physical aggression by parents against children abusive? how should we draw the line between justifiable parental discipline and actual child abuse? The stances represented at the meeting ranged from the view that a parent's slapping a child on the hand constituted abuse to the view that only life threatening violence should be labeled abusive behavior. Almost everyone, however, agreed that standards of behavior for parents had to be more flexible than standards of behavior exercised by the state and its representatives. (See Section IV of this report). The arguments surrounding these questions revolve around basic beliefs that affect the formulation of a definition. Core issues include:

1. whether to accept the premise that different definitions of child abuse should be developed for different clearly labeled functions.
2. whether primary consideration should be given to a) adult motivations and behavior toward a child, whether or not the child is actually

harmed b) the potential harm to a child of adult behavior or c) the actual impact of adult behavior on the child's ongoing physical, social, emotional and sexual development. Scholars have not yet demonstrated how to measure either the impact of psychological trauma on normative socio-emotional development or the longterm emotional effects of serious physical injury.

3. how we view our society's ability to alter and improve parental behavior and child development with the services that now exist. Those participants who supported an all embracing definition of child abuse tended to believe that social services are benign and will help more families than they hurt; others suggested that to be truly helpful and effective our society must focus its limited services on those who need them most.

We commend the efforts of the Institute of Judicial Administration/ American Bar Association Juvenile Justice Standards Project which suggested a new concept of the "endangered child" to cut through some of the problems discussed above. Their report, combined with the conference proceedings, might be a good starting point for the basic conceptual work on the problem of definition that is clearly needed. Further writing and debate are necessary before we make concrete policy decisions about a social problem whose definitions and parameters we have not agreed upon. Contributions from child advocates and members of the legal, medical and service delivery communities will be essential. A national commission composed of representatives of diverse viewpoints should develop and refine the variety of definitions that are needed. The commission's efforts could be coordinated with those of other panels under the auspices of the National Center.

IV. Socially Sanctioned Abuse

Recommendations

In order to end corporal punishment in schools and the mistreatment of public wards, we recommend:

1. Personnel of schools and institutions should receive in-service education about the needs of young people and about alternatives to the use of corporal punishment as a means of enforcing discipline.
2. Persistent lobbying and monitoring by concerned citizens including groups of parents and young people.
3. The establishment of government agencies to receive reports from citizens concerning conditions in public institutions; those agencies should be empowered to withhold funds from schools and institutions that flagrantly and repeatedly violate minimum standards.

* * * *

Virtually every discussion group at the conference considered various forms of socially sanctioned abuse, including corporal punishment in schools, mistreatment of children in protective, therapeutic and corrective institutions, abuse in the foster care and juvenile justice systems and corporate abuse reflected in technological products that are harmful to children. Even the social welfare and health delivery systems were implicated in the general agreement that widespread reforms in how the state cares for children are overdue. Some conference participants stressed that concern over parental violence against children should not distract us from correcting these less sensational, but nonetheless injurious, forms of systematic abuse. All agreed that the state and its agents must set the highest possible standard for the care of children in its charge, because of the state's symbolic importance for molding the behavior of private citizens toward children.

In testimony to the extent of concern over the legally sanctioned use of

corporal punishment, every policy discussion group at the conference condemned the use of corporal punishment in schools which only four states presently ban. Discussion focused on consistent evidence that such punishment fails to effectively deter misbehavior, discriminates against boys and members of minority groups, and teaches the use of physical aggression while militating against a positive environment for learning. At the same time discussants were aware of the many pressures on teachers and school officials who fear relinquishing corporal punishment as a means of self protection against student violence. Specific suggestions for eliminating corporal punishment from the schools included passage of state and federal legislation or administrative regulations prohibiting it, monitoring of schools by parents, government agencies and advocacy groups, and training teachers in alternative methods of discipline and classroom management. More controversy surrounded legal action regarding the use of limited corporal punishment by parents within the home, but the acceptance of corporal punishment in public settings was seen as encouraging physical punishment by parents.

Most policy groups also called for immediate action to eliminate mistreatment of children in residential institutions such as reformatories and homes for the dependent and the mentally or emotionally handicapped. Participants reiterated the widespread calls for the development of non-institutional systems of care where they are not presently available, and for the establishment of independent reviews of the care provided by residential institutions. Some participants suggested giving institutionalized children the same rights recently gained by adult patients, such as the right of voluntary consent to psychiatric treatments and medication. Personnel in non-educational institutions should receive in-service training on children's needs and acceptable disciplinary techniques.

A clear consensus existed at the meeting that deep-seated social approval of corporal discipline seems to legitimate institutional abuse of children in the United States. Several immediate steps can be taken that would attack both the underlying attitudes that perpetuate mistreatment of public wards and the abuses themselves. Educational workshops should be established for adults who staff schools and institutions. Policy makers should give further consideration to the problems inherent in attempting to balance the needs and rights of staff, parents, and children. Mechanisms should be established to assist parents and other concerned citizens in monitoring the quality of care and lobbying for necessary statutory changes. Government agencies should be empowered to cut off funds when violations occur and should encourage citizens to report to them. Although the extreme measure of withholding funds from an entire facility or district should be reserved for repeated or flagrant violations, the threat of that ultimate action should help to affect reforms. This committee recommends the establishment of structures to encourage and support the monitoring of public institutions by citizens' groups as an important practical step which had precedents in other areas of institutional care.

Finally, following the lead of several policy discussion groups, this committee recommends that young people be represented on community boards and visiting committees monitoring schools and institutions. As demonstrated by the teenagers who participated in the conference and by the representatives of the Children's Express (a group of school-age journalists who have conducted hearings in Washington on institutionalized children), young people can be effective advocates for the needs of their contemporaries. National organizations of young people such as the girl and boy scouts and church groups might consider making the investigation, publicity and lobbying concerning all forms of child abuse a priority for their activities.

V. The Law: Intervention and Child Abuse

Recommendation

1. All states should institute interdisciplinary panels to undertake continued scrutiny of local laws to insure that those laws preserve the delicate balance between the rights of children, the family, natural parents and the state.

* * * *

Although a systematic discussion of legal issues was beyond the scope of this conference, legal issues underlie the debate surrounding what to do about the problem of child abuse. The delicate balance between the rights of children, the family, natural parents and the state merits continued expert scrutiny by representatives of the legal profession, the helping services, scholars and the communities whose childrearing values family law should support and enhance. These groups should meet together at the state level where most laws governing child abuse are enacted in order to exchange information, monitor statutes and services and make their views known to lawmakers. Laws and related services should be continually reevaluated as our society makes progress in defining child abuse and learns more about the extent and causes of the problem.

Although no proposals regarding the law received repeated attention or widespread endorsement this committee believes that three suggestions designed to protect family rights merit debate:

1. The range of reportable offenses which justify legal intervention by the state should be narrowed. Some participants felt strongly that reporting laws should focus only on actions that threaten serious physical harm to a child so that overextended social service systems could concentrate scarce resources on the children most at risk.
2. Another contingent suggested that in order to maintain family ties,

state laws should require that protective services attempt to place children removed from their natural parents with relatives.

3. The state's right to intervene in family life should be limited by the countervailing values of family autonomy, privacy and integrity unless a clear, identifiable threshold of risk is passed. In the absence of a social consensus about what constitutes that threshold, the state should be cautious in exercising its legal perogatives.

VI. Prevention of Child Abuse and Needed Services

Recommendations

1. Parenting education should be required in school for children aged 6 and up and should be available in a variety of settings for adults of all ages on a voluntary basis. The Office of Education, National Institute of Education and similar agencies on the state level should identify, develop and distribute sample curricula. Parents and students should be involved in developing programs at the local level to insure that they do not offend community sensibilities. Parenting education in schools should be mandated by law.
2. Broad, supportive family services are needed to provide ongoing support to parents. the many services and institutions that already exist in every community should be enlisted to help prevent child abuse. These include religious organizations, employers, and schools.
3. Every community should develop an inventory of services for children and families and make it available through a single-door referral service. Volunteer groups could play a crucial role in taking such inventories and establishing referral services. The National Center could help by identifying or developing model approaches.
4. Community "gatekeepers" should be trained to provide informal advice and referrals to families.
5. Services for families that seek help should include a wide variety of supports such as homemaker assistance and crisis day care.
6. Continuing research and evaluation are needed to test the effectiveness of various approaches and programs and to improve our understanding of what causes child abuse.

* * * *

All policy groups concentrated their discussion of services on the need for broad supportive family and child programs designed to prevent abuse from occurring. Participants believed that services should not be limited to intervening only after a family is in serious difficulty. Many of the ideas participants developed rested on the assumption that the United States should move away from viewing child abuse as a disease which is an isolatable phenomenon. Instead, participants implied, the various stresses of 24-hour parenting, combined with social and structural tensions, lead to situations in which some parents become abusive. Support services for parents, it was believed, would help alleviate these tensions. The development of programs for prevention and service delivery is necessarily tied to eventual decisions about how abuse should be defined and to the state of our knowledge about the causes, extent and distribution of child abuse.

The wide variety of proposals concerning prevention and services emphasized the need to enhance and use the many supportive services and institutions that exist in virtually every community. Child abuse prevention should be integrated not just with the social welfare system but with the network of agencies with which most families interact. Those institutions include schools, churches, and places of employment. An immediate and essential step involves communication, cooperation and coordination between the groups in each community that can help parents. An inventory and evaluation of general support services, and services for families experiencing difficulties is needed for every community. Examples of this kind of inventory exist in some recent centers that catalogue the availability of day care facilities. Volunteer groups such as the Junior League, Jaycees or PTA could shoulder responsibility for preparing inventories. Single door referral services or child care bureaus should be

formed to provide ongoing access to and up-dating of the information. National models for surveying resources and establishing referral services should be developed and made widely available.

Participants expressed general agreement that because isolated families appear to engage in more abusive behavior, it is important to find new ways to reach them without engaging in labeling, which implies social deviancy and may well be counter-productive. Increased sympathetic awareness of the difficult task facing parents is one longterm step. It seems crucial to re-educate the "gatekeeper" figures in the community -- social service personnel, police, child care workers, clergy, etc. -- so that they will offer guidance and support instead of judgement.

Widespread efforts to increase popular understanding of family crises and to publicize available supportive services seemed the key to prevention. Conference participants hoped to mobilize a variety of community figures to offer informal help and referrals to families experiencing stress or other difficulties that could lead to child abuse. Specific suggestions included the education and workshop training of teachers, clergy, and others who have contact with children and families to help families contact appropriate services. Paraprofessionals serving as neighborhood child abuse experts might help these "gatekeepers" to encourage self-help rather than to report suspects. In addition to the creation of supportive networks for families, participants recommended such simple measures as placing posters in supermarkets to indicate the range of services available to families. These preventive measures, like those that follow, would cost relatively little compared to the legal fees and longterm intervention required once physical abuse occurs.

In addition to the general services that most child advocates propose, such as increased availability of day care and child health services,

several suggestions centered around special services for new and expectant parents to provide support and socialization for parenthood. First, family-centered child birth in hospitals received support because many participants assumed that it fosters better attachment bonding between babies and parents, and eases the integration of the new member into the family by improving family cohesion. That assumption about the nature of bonding merits empirical research. Second, many participants supported the idea of a buddy system which would pair two sets of new parents, or new parents with those who have a one year old child. These couples could share concerns or frustrations and offer each other reassurance or informal advice. Third, hospitals should be responsible for educating the parents of premature, handicapped and other children at high risk of abuse about the kinds of problems they will encounter, and the services available to them. All of these proposals merit further research on how parents respond to various infant behaviors and on the efficacy of various approaches.

Special services are needed for families that perceive themselves to be at high risk of abuse. Crisis day care and hot lines should be available on a 24-hour basis in every community. Older citizens could be trained to help deliver crisis day care, along the lines of ACTION's Foster Grandparent program. CETA workers could also be used as caretakers, or equally important, as home visitors. Again, participants believed that families are confused and overwhelmed by the different service agencies they come into contact with and recommended "one-door service." Because of the wide disparities among communities in services available to troubled families national guidelines and mandatory reporting laws need reevaluation so that the law does not require compliance with services the state cannot adequately provide.

Many areas for basic research cry out in the areas of prevention and service delivery. For example, what correlation, if any, exists between the availability of support services in a community and the incidence of abuse? Does the very knowledge that services exist ease family tension and reduce the incidence of violence? How much child abuse really exists, and is it concentrated in particular areas or subpopulations? How well are different models of social service programs succeeding in reducing abuse? How successful are various kinds of social services in reducing the incidence of abuse? Why are infants under the age of two more likely to be victims of abuse than are older children? Do parents from ethnic groups that maintain strong extended family ties, and who live near their relatives, engage in less abusive behavior than more isolated parents?

Every discussion group supported the widespread implementation of parenting education programs for people of all ages. Because of the high priority assigned to parenting education, this committee felt it merited extended discussion in our report.

Support for parent education as a preventive strategy grew from several assumptions. Many participants believed that parents' unrealistic expectations about their children contribute to the likelihood of their using abusive methods of discipline or losing their tempers with unanticipated results. Knowledge about child development and skills for handling children would, it is believed, lessen the incidence of unintentional abuse. This committee suggests that although such precepts make sense, they need further study and scientific evaluation. In the meantime, parent education is a relatively inexpensive way to influence many families. By serving everyone, educational programs bypass the need to predict who might be a potential abuser and avoid the labeling that characterizes many prevention programs. When carefully designed to protect cultural diversity, parenting education need not discri-

minate against any socio-economic or ethnic group.

Specific recommendations about parenting education emphasized that it should be an integral part of school curricula from kindergarten through high school, perhaps in conjunction with broader family life education. Programs were also recommended, on a voluntary basis, for parents expecting their first child, parents of young children, and perhaps for parents adjusting to their children's subsequent developmental stages such as adolescence. Clearly this wide view of parenting education suggests a community based approach in which schools would be only one source of education. Parents and young people should be actively involved in planning and refining the curricula. The opportunity to observe and play with children should be integrated into programs for school age students and expectant parents.

Teenage representatives to the conference suggested that in addition to factual information about child development and child care students should learn about what kinds of stress on parents might generate abusive behavior, and should be familiar with services that are available to all members of their families. They suggested that children of all ages needed to know where they could seek help both during childhood and when they later became parents. "If you can't help the parents of today," they concluded, "please help us, the parents of tomorrow."

Implementation of parenting education would be eased by increased state involvement including mandates concerning curricula and funding for the development and evaluation of programs. Although public support for programs like sex education has been increasing, some public resistance may result from fear of increased government and professional "intrusion" into family life and mores. That problem makes the full participation of local teenagers and parents crucial to the success of parenting

education. A review of existing parenting education curriculum plans is an important first step. Some new materials probably need to be developed. Curricula should be widely disseminated to community organizations as well as school systems, and should be reviewed in accordance with guidelines that need to be developed to insure that programs are as culturally "value-free" as possible. Finally, evaluations of the effectiveness of parent education in general and of different approaches to it need to be carried out.

VII. The Communications Industries: Television, Newspapers and Magazines.

Recommendations

1. The communications industries should devote more space to more realistic and balanced news coverage and dramatic portrayals of children and family life.
2. Public interest groups should take responsibility for developing informational campaigns that increase public understanding of abuse and emphasize prevention. The media should make time and space available for public service announcements on abuse and family life. Television announcements should be made during prime time.
3. Regional and national councils composed of scholars, social service professionals, concerned citizens' groups and representatives of the media should be established to promote better coverage of children's issues.

* * * *

Suggestions concerning the role that the media could play in helping to combat the problem of child abuse fell into two major categories: the media's role in helping to gain support for the other policy suggestions generated at the conference and the media's responsibility to create sophisticated awareness of social problems such as abuse/neglect and their causes. Although most of the discussion and recommendations focused on television, many suggestions seem to be equally relevant to the print media. Virtually every suggestion that follows could be applied to newspaper and magazine as well as broadcast coverage of children's issues.

Participants agreed that television, which has joined families and schools as a major agent of socialization, could play a uniquely effective role in helping to change attitudes toward children and childrearing. Specific suggestions ranged from the increased use of public service announcements to more complex portrayals of family life and problems within standard

entertainment series as well as in "specials" aimed at both adults and children. Participants felt that an emphasis on increasing the appreciation of children and their needs, a reduction in the incidence of violence depicted, a portrayal of alternatives to physical punishment for children, and the use of realistic problems and families in television plots constitute essential first steps.

Several major shifts in approach were recommended besides increased time and space for issues concerning children and parents. It seemed that most programs that have been aired focused on where abusive parents could seek help. Parents Anonymous has frequently figured prominently in these programs to the exclusion of other means of prevention and treatment. Although the self help approach Parents Anonymous uses aids some families, especially those already well motivated, its prominence on television fosters an exaggerated belief in the efficacy of individual control. The media may focus on organized parents groups for reasons of convenience that are not clear to viewers. Such groups provide quick, convenient sources of information and interviews. In order to be more realistic and thorough, future programs should begin to depict a variety of possible outcomes for families in which abuse has occurred.

More public service announcements on child abuse and family stress should be developed and aired in prime time. Instead of just warning parents that certain behaviors constitute abuse, some participants suggested the creation of public service announcements along the lines of the cancer warning signals. Those announcements could suggest that if parents are experiencing stress, they should not hesitate to seek assistance in caring for their children. Messages should give concrete information about various kinds of help and where to obtain them. Several policy groups, including the "Teenager's Caucus," suggested that a series of public service messages

be developed that would help children understand what constitutes abusive behavior and where to seek help for themselves. This committee endorses that concept but urges that announcements be designed with great caution to avoid any suggestion of hysteria or interference in normal family discipline; the announcements should differentiate between the tensions most families experience and situations in which children are endangered. These television "spots" should be aimed at children of all ages and be aired on Saturday mornings and in cartoon periods as well as with shows that attract teenage viewers. Network representatives to the conference suggested that citizens' groups desiring to initiate public service announcements contact network personnel for help in designing effective messages.

During conference discussion periods media representatives sometimes felt, or were put, on the defensive for neglecting children's issues and oversimplifying problems, but conference participants did develop a recognition of the practical problems the communications industry faces. Some journalists held that the media can only report on what exists and what is known, but cannot transform an area of social behavior, and cannot be more advanced than a field of research or treatment itself. Persons concerned with child abuse and other social problems should be made aware of how best to use the media, and should share responsibility for the media's failures. Scholars and child advocates bear a responsibility to share information with reporters and producers so that they can develop stories. Particular attention was devoted to making child advocates aware of the resources of local stations as opposed to networks. Local stations apparently often need programming ideas. Child advocates should offer their services as consultants on children's issues to advisory boards for networks and magazines. Some conference participants suggested the formation of an ongoing committee

to help guide media policy on child and family issues. Others recommended regional meetings between local journalists and TV station producers and local advocates, scholars and social service representatives.

Many practical problems restrict media coverage of abuse. Media representatives felt that they had to produce what sells. How, they wondered, could they transform some of the basic research in the child abuse field into news? There is also a shortage of money for developing programs about child and family problems, which the industry does not regard as commercial ventures. The ABC after-school specials were cited as successful efforts that should be expanded. Increased government, foundation and corporation grants would be useful. Where programs on abuse <u>are</u> produced the television codes, designed to reduce the incidence of violence on television, prevent depicting the outcome of violence. The rules allow cameras to show a belt being raised to hit a child, but not the impact of the whipping on the child himself. Many participants felt that this kind of coverage trivializes violent acts, and makes viewers more concerned with the problems of the perpetrator than with the effects on the victim. Finally, one journalist suggested that the communications industry needs to learn where to get information on these sorts of problems. The research he had access to reflected a conventional case-oriented approach to abuse. He had no idea about the stress factors associated with abusive behavior, or about where to obtain more analytical information. <u>Scholars and advocates should attempt to share information with representatives of the media as well as with local, state and federal officials</u>.

VIII. Research Issues

Recommendations

1. Research and funding for research regarding every aspect of child abuse should be increased. Coordinated funding efforts should be developed at the national level, involving, for example, the National Center, branches of the National Institutes of Health, and the Office of Education. In addition, a small percentage of all funds devoted to children's programs should be set aside for research.
2. Research on child abuse should be integrated into the mainstream of scholarship in established disciplines.

* * * *

Research concerning all aspects of child abuse is still inadequate, and further knowledge is necessary for designing the most productive social policies and services. Discussants recommended wide ranging research priorities including studies on the etiology, prevention and treatment and effects of abuse on children and families. Specific research suggestions are indicated throughout this report.

One major recommendation concerns funding for research. One discussion group suggested that research funds be built into any service delivery or preventive programs by setting up a Children's Trust Fund similar to those in Europe. This committee suggests that federal officials consider reserving between one and five percent of all funds devoted to children's services or child abuse services for basic research that will ultimately improve services. Federal agencies involved in research about children should coordinate their efforts by pooling resources for funding basic research on child abuse.

Delegates to the conference emphasized that both basic and applied research were necessary, but did not determine priorities. Most participants agreed that methods of evaluation should be built into the design

of all model programs. In addition to evaluating whether and why programs succeed in helping the people who use them, more research is needed to determine why some programs are underutilized and how to make services more attractive to recipients. Participants agreed that evaluation of programs was important, but also stressed the importance of further basic research on the causes of abuse. It seems important for basic research on child abuse to be integrated into the mainstream of interdisciplinary scholarship. This integration would both improve the quality of research and subject it to rigorous examination and debate.

IX. Child Abuse and Broader Social Issues

Recommendations

1. Although programs to prevent child abuse cannot await broader social reform, child advocates should work for a variety of policies that would signify a national commitment to the well-being of children. Such reforms would include providing decent medical care and a base-line standard of living for all families.
2. Each state observing the International Year of the Child should pass at least one piece of concrete legislation for children, such as the outlawing of corporal punishment in schools, or the mandating of parenting education programs for all school-age children.
3. The United States should develop programs for day care, better housing, full employment, medical insurance, coordinated social services, full employment and national policies designed to facilitate family life. State and local governments and private companies should join the national government in efforts to enhance family life.

* * * *

Although participants in this conference attempted to develop concrete and manageable policy proposals which reflect a realistic appraisal of the current fiscal austerity regarding social welfare, the recurrent theme that the United States needs to reform its social environment, confront structural problems, and support policies that enhance family life could not be ignored. At the risk of merely echoing every national meeting on childhood since 1909, if not since the National Conference of Charities and Correction first met in 1876, conference participants agreed that in addition to the specific strategies outlined above basic reforms are needed to reduce the incidence of child abuse and attack conditions that inhibit the optimal development of children.

A national commitment to the wellbeing of children would be reflected in policies designed to guarantee every child decent medical care and nutrition; reduce the unemployment often correlated with violence toward children; and guarantee base-line standards of living, adequate housing, day care, and social services. Interested professionals should monitor all proposed legislation to see how it will affect children. Advocacy networks at both the state and federal level, along the lines of experiments now being conducted by the Children's Defense Fund and other groups should be expanded and strengthened.

Some policy groups endorsed specific pending national legislation that seemed to correspond with reforms many participants sought. Those bills include the Child Welfare Provisions of HR 7200 so that neglected children should not be held hostage in foster care during the overhaul of the federal welfare system; the CHAP -- Child Health Assessment Program -- to expand eligibility for federal child health programs; and the expansion of Title XX of the Social Security Act focusing on comprehensive services for children and families.

Policy groups cited state and local responsibilities, as well as the positive role the private sector could play. Large companies should expand their efforts to devise employment policies and services that would foster family life. Model programs, with quality controls, should be publicized with cost analyses. Child care professionals and advocates should offer their services in setting up such programs. Ongoing coalitions at the local level among private and public organizations and corporations to coordinate and facilitate the development of an environment conducive to family life would enlarge the potential impact of individual reforms.

Each state that is observing the International Year of the Child, some participants suggested, should pass at least one piece of concrete legisla-

tion to improve the lives of children rather than enacting a symbolic proclamation of participation. This committee endorses that proposal. Possible legislation includes the abolition of corporal punishment in schools and institutions, the mandating of parent education, or a measure to insure that every child receives inoculations against childhood diseases.

Many participants expressed interest in using the conference to form the core of national and regional networks for actions on behalf of children. Those networks should include adults and children who use family services as well as those who provide them, researchers, and representatives of the media and of public and private service groups. In the course of ongoing meetings and correspondence these groups could set up task forces to explore policy options in greater detail, lobby to obtain reforms in their geographical areas, and serve as a line of communication between disciplines. Local public interest groups could use these recommendations and the conference discussion questions as well as discussion guides like the Carnegie Council's Checklist to refine their own priorities and decide on directions for concrete action.

In summary, while specific actions will help to prevent and contain child abuse, the problem of child abuse is so closely related to the general problems of American children and families that in the long run massive social reform and advocacy seem necessary. Child abuse cannot be separated from the range of children's policy issues, but it may serve as a focal point for obtaining needed reforms.

X. Appendices

Appendix A: Instructions Distributed to Policy Discussion Groups

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR DISCUSSIONS

— Try to make concrete proposals and set clear priorities in your recommendations.

— The questions listed below are meant to open discussion -- each group should feel free to add new questions and categories.

— Keep in mind that limited resources, funds and personnel are available for child protection.

— Some considerations listed below may be applicable to questions besides those under which they appear.

— We have not specifically asked you to examine the best methods of preserving diverse cultural values or other aspects of service delivery, in large part because these topics are so adequately covered at the annual HEW conferences. You may, however, wish to include comments on these topics where appropriate.

SOME QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

I. How should child abuse/neglect be defined?

— Consider a) whether we should differentiate between parental behavior and the impact of parental actions on the child's development, and b) institutional abuses (schools, hospitals, courts, foster care etc.) as well as those that take place within the family.

Examine for example a) the impact of broad or narrow definitions on social policy regarding prevention and intervention and b) the impact of different definitions on the establishment of priorities for using limited financial and human resources.

— How can definitions be developed that tolerate the diversity of ideas that exist in our society about what constitutes "acceptable behavior towards children," that respect racial and ethnic differences, and that simultaneously protect the well-being of children?

II. What should be done to prevent abuse before it occurs?

— What people and organizations, both inside and outside traditional service agencies can be recruited to help prevent abuse?

— Consider the variety of approaches to prevention that you are discussing (such as homemaker services and visits, hotlines and parent groups, crisis child care) with regard to:

a) whether they are appropriate for government action,
b) what services already exist, and what steps can be taken to initiate and develop such programs, and
c) how preventive efforts can protect the integrity of families and their rights to privacy without ignoring the various, and sometimes conflicting, needs of individual family members?

— Given the resources, programs and services for families that already exist, how can they be brought to bear on the problem of preventing abuse and neglect? How can families be encouraged to use services as they become available?

— Parent education may have the potential to influence the largest number of families because it does not attempt to predict and label potential abusers. What organizations already exist that can provide parent education? Who should define the content? Should it be required? How can it be made culturally "value fair"? At what different points throughout a person's life might varying approaches to education be helpful?

III. How do families, communities and programs interact?

— What respective roles can families and service providers play in making critical policy decisions, setting goals, establishing services and evaluating the success of child abuse and neglect programs provided in their communities? How can unmet needs, gaps in services and unfulfilled objectives be identified and corrected?

— Who are the potential child advocates in a community? How can they translate their concern into informed activity?

— How can outreach efforts be developed to bring families and services together? Consider professional, volunteer and informal resources.

IV. How can the media help to prevent abuse?

— What role can the media play in educating people about parenting, child abuse and neglect? What role should it play in informing the public about available family and child services? How can it help change the image of abuse and neglect in our society and diminish psychological barriers that discourage people from using community services?

— How can human services programs, including those concerned with children, be made newsworthy so that the media can cover them consistently, and in proportion to the government and energy and funds expended on them?

— How should issues such as child abuse, neglect and sexual molestation be used as thematic elements in dramatic programming?

— How can children and the problems of family life be realistically portrayed? Consider, for example, whether broadcast codes need review and revision.

V. What role can the methodology and knowledge of social scientists play in efforts to prevent, detect and treat child abuse and neglect?

— How can basic research be used to develop a definition of child abuse/neglect and concrete programs for prevention?

— How can research findings and past experience be used to inform decision-making in individual cases?

— What empirical data is needed to support or reject popular assumptions about child abuse (i.e. most abused children become abusive parents, child abuse is directly linked to economic status, etc.) in order to develop policy based on

sound knowledge? How, for example, can information about non-abusive families be used to help understand the mistreatment of children (i.e. what differentiates the abused child who becomes an abusive parent from one who doesn't)?

— How can programs be developed at the state and local level, where primary responsibility in abuse cases rests, to develop ongoing practical exchange between researchers, agency officials and the communications industry? How could such exchange be mutually beneficial?

Appendix B: Conference Registration List

CHILD ABUSE: CULTURAL ROOTS AND POLICY OPTIONS
November 20-21, 1978
Conference Participants (Partial List)

J. Lawrence Aber
Special Asst. to the Director
Mass. Office for Children

Lynn Abraham
Judge
Philadelphia, PA

Virginia Downes Addis
Honorary Commissioner
Internatl. Year of the Child

Jean Adnapose
Child Study Center
Yale University

Mary D. Salter Ainsworth
Commonwealth Prof. of Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Virginia

George Albee
Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
University of Vermont

Karen Alexander
Yale University

Peter O. Almond
Consultant
Carnegie Council on Children

Karen Anderson
Staff Writer
Bush Center in Child Dev. and
Social Policy at Yale Univ.

Elena Androunas
Visiting Scholar
University of Pennsylvania

Harry J. Aponte
Director
Phila. Child Guidance Center

Helena Arbonies
Staff, Yale University

Art Armijo
Bureau Chief
Children & Youth Serv. Bureau
(New Mexico representative)

Kay Armstrong
Volunteer Director/Evaluator
Family Support Center

(N) Louise Armstrong
Author: Kiss Daddy Goodnight

Susan S. Aronson, M.D.
Director, Health Advocacy
Training Program
Medical College of Pennsylvania

Quinn Bakaty
Reporter
The Children's Express

Maurine Ballard
Bush Center
UCLA

(N) David J. Bearison, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Graduate School & Univ. Ctr.
City University of New York

Michael J. Begab, Ph.D.
Head, Mental Retardation
Research Ctrs. Prog., NICHD

George K. Behlmer
Lecturer in History
Department of History
Yale University

Professor Laszlo Benedek
Head of Graduate Studies
School of the Arts
New York University

Teri Bennett
Yale University

Mindy Berman
B'nai B'rith Youth Organization

Sandra Bernstein, R.N., M.S.N.
Doctoral Student
Temple University

(N) Dr. Anne Beuf
Coordinator, Women's Studies
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Dr. Francesco G. Beuf
Children's Hospital of Phila.

Michael Blady
Coordinator, Program Services
National Council of Jewish Women

Delois Blakely
Honorary Commissioner,
Internatl. Year of the Child

Burton Blatt
Centennial Professor and Dean
School of Education
Syracuse University

Edward Blatt
Graduate Student
Developmental Psychology Dept.
Syracuse University

Suzanne Blinkoff
Assistant Editor
The Children's Express

Marcus Boggs
Editor
Oxford University Press

Frank Bolton, Jr.
Coordinator of Psychological
Services, Bureau of Children,
Families and Aging
AZ Dept. of Economic Security

(N) Kathy Bonk
Media Reform Committee

(N) Kirk A. Bradford, D.S.W.
Consultant
Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Carmen Branch
Research Analyst--Met. Life

Phyllis Breidenbaugh
Chief, Bureau of Child
Protective Service
(Virginia representative)

Orville G. Brim, Jr.
President
Foundation for Child Development

Robert L. Burgess
Professor of Human Development
College of Human Development
Penn State University

Deborah Burrell
Project Asst. for Casework Serv.
St. Christopher's Hosp. for Children

Carole H. Butler
Program Director
National Indian Child Abuse and
Neglect Resource Center
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Richard B. Byrne
Associate Dean
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Southern California

(N) JoAnne Byrnes
Assistant Prosecutor, Hunterdon Co.
Office of the County Prosecutor

Vivian Cadden
Editor
McCall's Working Mother

Jean Caldwell
Correspondent
The Boston Globe

James Cameron
Director of Child Protective Serv.
Family & Child Welfare Services

(N) David Campbell
Associate Professor
School of Gov't. & Public Admin.
American University

Joyce Campbell
Program Manager
WETA-TV
Washington, D.C.

Michael Arthur Campbell
Bush Center at UCLA

Diane Carey
Bush Center Coordinator at UCLA

(N) Indicates person registered but was unable to attend.

John Mack Carter
Editor
Good Housekeeping

Mary Ann Chalmers
Doctoral Student
University of Pennsylvania

Ron Chambers
Senior Editor
The Free Press

Anne Chappelka, ACSW
Community Educator
The SCAN Center

Peggy Charren
President
Action for Children's Television

Odile R. Childress
Director, Family Resources Ctr.
St. Christopher's Hospital

Robert Choate
President
Council on Children, Media and Merchandising

Chul-Soo Chung
Visiting Scholar
University of Pennsylvania

Robert Clampitt
Publisher
The Children's Express

Joyce Clinton
Program Analyst
Office of Special Concerns
Office of Asst. Sec. for Planning and Evaluation, H.E.W.

Dr. George V. Coelho
Senior Social Scientist
Office of Asst. Director for Children & Youth, NIMH

(N) D. Walter Cohen, D.D.S.
Dean, School of Dental Medicine
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Emily Cohen
Research Associate
Cornell University

Sandra B. Cohen, ACSW, Coor.
Child Welfare Training Program
School of Social Administration
Temple University

Deborah Cohn
Bush Center at Univ. of Michigan

Joy Colelli
Director of Family Support Serv.
Head Start
Madison, Wisconsin

Devey Comer-Hilbert
Associate Director
The SCAN Center

Jackqueline T. Cooke
Executive Director
Day Care & Child Development Council of America

Carol Cooper
Chief Social Worker
Department of Pediatrics
Yale New Haven Hospital

(N) Mrs. Edith Cooper
Congressional Research Service
Science Policy Research DW
Library of Congress

Gloria Cooper
Associate Editor
Columbia Journalism Review
Columbia University

Mr. John F. Cox
Director, Teacher Rights
National Education Association

Bobbie J. Creque
AFL-CIO

Mary K. Critchell
Program Representative
Teaching-Learning Communities

Joseph Crumbley
Coordinator of Outreach Services
The SCAN Center

Barbara Cundiff
Social Service Consultant
Div. of Family & Childrens Serv.
Ga. Dept. of Human Resources
(Georgia representative)

(N) Marcia A. Dake, Ed.D., R.N.
Director of Program Development
Nursing and Health Services
American Red Cross

Jack Daly
Graduate Student
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Dr. Martin Deutsch
Director, Institute for Developmental Studies
Professor, Dept. of Early Childhood Education
School of Education, Health, Nursing & Arts Professions
New York University

Wilton S. Dillon
Director, Smithsonian Symposia and Seminars
Smithsonian Institution

Paul DiLorenzo
Social Worker
Natl. Conference of Catholic Charities
Philadelphia, PA

John Dimling
Vice President, Research
Natl. Assn. of Broadcasters
Washington, D.C.

(N) Jean Diodato
Outreach Worker
Catholic Social Services

Mildred A. Disbrow, Ph.D.
Professor, Maternal & Child Nursing SC-74
University of Michigan

Humphrey Doermann
Bush Foundation

(N) Paul R. Dokecki
Senior Research Associate
Institute for Public Policy Studies
Vanderbilt University

Kay Drews
Project Manager
Child Abuse & Neglect Project
Amer. Public Welfare Assoc.

David F. Duncan, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Dept. of Health Education
Southern Illinois University

Ms. Aileen Edgington
Chief, Social Work Services
Children & Youth Project
Dallas, TX

Virginia Edwards
Editor and Publisher
Today's Child Newsmagazine
Roosevelt, N.J.

Byron Egeland
Professor
University of Minnesota

(N) Harold Eidlin
Public Information Officer
Administration for Children, Youth and Families, H.E.W.

(N) Jane Cummings Eleey
Bala Cynwyd, PA

(N) Mike Eleey
University of Pennsylvania

Dr. Nancy B. Ellis
Associate Professor
School of Allied Medical Professions
University of Pennsylvania

Miss Elizabeth Elmer
Director of Research & Training
Parental Stress Center
Pittsburgh, PA

(N) Pamela Emil
Photographer
New York, NY

Ms. Jo Ensminger
Senior Social Worker
Center for Rape Concern
Philadelphia, PA

Norman B. Epstein, Ph.D.
Asst. Prof. of Psychology in Psychiatry, Dept. of Psychiatry
University of Pennsylvania
Marriage Council of Philadelphia

Eunice K. M. Ernst
Consultant
Maternity Center Assoc., NYC

Claire Fagin
Dean, School of Nursing
University of Pennsylvania

Valerie Farnham
University of Pennsylvania

Lilly Feldman
Head Start
Madison, Wisconsin

Shel Feldman
Professor
Swarthmore, PA

Marilyn Felt
Project Director
Education Development Ctr., Inc.
Newton, MA

Happy Fernandez
Ass. Professor
Child Care Department
Temple University

Kathleen H. Dunlop
Assoc. Prof. of Educ. & Psych.
Senior Research Associate
Center for the Study of
Families & Children
Vanderbilt Institute for
Public Policy Studies
Vanderbilt University

Norma Deitch Feshbach
Prof. of Educ. & Psychology
Graduate School of Education
UCLA

Seymour Feshbach
Professor and Chairman
Department of Psychology
UCLA

Dr. Helen G. First
Clinical Assoc. Prof. of Psych.
and Human Behavior (Retired)
Thomas Jefferson University

Joseph M. First, Esq.
University of Pennsylvania

Harold J. Fishbein
Executive Director
American Association for
Maternal & Child Health

(N) Bernard C. Fisher
Executive Director
Citizens' Comm. for Children of NY

(N) Dr. Regina Flesch
Medical Research Scientist
Eastern Penn. Psychiatric Inst.

Mary Louise Foote
Program Development Specialist
Protective Services
Division of Youth & Family Serv.

Dr. Michael Fox
Pediatric Psychiatrist
University of Maryland Hosp.

Harold M. Frank
University of Pennsylvania

Stephen Franklin
Reporter
Philadelphia Bulletin

SuEllen Fried, President
Kansas Chapter, National Comm.
for Prevention of Child Abuse
Shawnee Mission, Kansas

Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr.
Associate Prof. of Sociology
University of Pennsylvania

Ms. Jeannette Gagnon
Chief, Bureau of Child and
Family Services
NH Division of Welfare
(New Hampshire representative)
Concord, N.H.

Susan Pelkes Gantman, Esq.
Assistant District Attorney
Montgomery County Court House

James Garbarino
Director of Maltreatment of
Youth Project
Center for the Study of
Youth Development
Boystown, Nebraska

Bernard Gavzer
Health & Science Producer
NewsCenter 4
New York, N.Y.

Richard Gelles
Professor and Chairman
Sociology Department
University of Rhode Island

Rochel Gelman
Professor
University of Pennsylvania

George Gerbner
Prof. of Communications & Dean
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Ilona Gerbner
Lecturer
Faculty of Arts & Science
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Ruth Gilbert
Sec. for Community Action
Board of Global Ministries
United Methodist Church
New York, N.Y.

Joanne M. Gillis, Ph.D.
Clinical Psychologist
Jefferson Family Life and
Study Center
Jefferson University

(N) David Gilman, Esq.
Director IJA-ABA Juvenile
Justice Standards Project

(N) Thomas P. Glynn
Assistant Director
Office of Policy & Planning
ACTION

Dr. Roberta Goldberg
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania

Mona Goldenberg
Program Associate, Div. of
Field Services
Bank Street College of Education
New York, N.Y.

Mark Gonzalez
Research Assistant
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Marion S. Goodman
Head Start Director and
Early Childhood Educator

Alan M. Gordon
Graduate Student
Harvard University

Edmund W. Gordon
Richard March Hoe Professor
of Psychology & Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Susan Gordon
Associate Professor of
Clinical Pediatrics

Winnie Gorlin
CBS/Broadcast Group
CBS, Inc.

(N) Roberto Grandi
Visiting Scholar
University of Pennsylvania

Frederick C. Green
Associate Director
Children's Hospital National
Medical Center
Washington, D.C.

(N) Thomas G. Gregory
Director of Research Use and
Public Service
Center for the Study of Youth
Development

Sandra Grilikhes
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Joan F. Grindley
Associate Chairperson Nursing
of Children
School of Nursing
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Susan Gross
B'nai B'rith

Herbert J. Grossman, M.D.
Professor of Psychiatry
UCLA

(N) Dr. Edith H. Grotberg
Director, Research & Evaluation Div.
Admin. for Children & Youth &
Families, H.E.W.

(N) Antonia Guccione
Teacher - Learning Disabled/
Emotionally Handicapped

Rae Gummel
Vice President
Children's Rights, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

(N) Barbara Gurdin
Protective Serv. Prog. Manager
Iowa Dept. of Social Services
(Iowa representative)

Julia Hall
Teaching Fellow
Bush Center
University of North Carolina

Kevin Hancock
Youth Emergency Services
Philadelphia, PA

Carolyn Harmon
Principal
Lewin & Associates, Inc.

Heather Harr-Hazer
Graduate Student
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

James A. Harrell
Social Science Analyst
National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect
Washington, D.C.

LTC. Richard E. Hartzell
Psychology Consultant
U.S. Army
Washington, D.C.

(N) John Hayden
Editor, Health Affairs
University of Pennsylvania

Hugh Haywood
Assoc. Exec. Dir. Residential Serv.
Queensboro Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children
Jamaica, N.Y.

Cathy Heindl
Nursing Coordinator
The SCAN Center
Philadelphia, PA

Kirby Heller
Bush Center at Yale University

Martin Hellman
Spec. Asst. to the Exec. Director
The Wiltwyck School
Secretary, Center for the Study of Youth Services and Juvenile Justice
New York, N.Y.

Ellen C. Herrenkohl
Assistant Professor
Psychology Department
Lehigh University

Roy C. Herrenkohl, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Social Research
Lehigh University

Dr. Alexander Hersh
Assoc. Prof. of Social Work
School of Social Work
University of Pennsylvania

Fairfield Hoban
Attorney
New York, NY

Nicholas Hobbs
Professor of Psychology and Director
Center for the Study of Children and the Family
Vanderbilt University

Gloria Hochman
Writer
Philadelphia, PA

Michael Arthur Hoffman
Bush Center at UCLA

Albert R. Hollenbeck, Ph.D.
Staff Fellow, NIMH
Asst. Prof. of Psychology
George Mason University
Bethesda, MD

Charles Hollings
Reporter
The Children's Express
New York, N.Y.

Jeff Homel
B'nai B'rith Youth Organization
Philadelphia, PA

Patrice D. Horn
Senior Editor
Self Magazine
New York, N.Y.

Robert Hornik
Associate Professor
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Frances Humphrey Howard
Natl. Institutes of Health
Natl. Library of Medicine
Bethesda, MD

(N) Irwin Hyman
Director, Center for the Study of Corporal Punishment
Temple University

Andrea Ignatoff
Public Information Director
Women in Transition
Philadelphia, PA

Stephanie Jackson
Community Involvement Program
Friends Center
Philadelphia, PA

(N) Bill Jamieson, Jr.
Director
Dept. of Economic Security
(Arizona representative)

Juel Janis, Ph.D.
Special Assistant to Assistant Secretary for Health
HEW

Mogens Jensen
Bush Center at Yale University

Dr. Carole Joffe
Assistant Professor
Graduate School of Education
Bryn Mawr College

Stanley Johnson
Chaplain
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Mary Kaaren Jolly, J.D.
Staff Director
Subcomm. on the Constitution
U.S. Senate

Annie Jones
Philadelphia, PA

Mr. Frank Jones
Program Officer
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Princeton, N.J.

(N) Margaret J. Jones
Executive Director
Coalition for Children & Youth

Rosa Juarbe
Aspira Inc. of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA

Lynn Kagan
Bush Center at Yale University

Alfred J. Kahn
Professor of Social Policy and Social Planning
School of Social Work
Columbia University

Dr. Beatrice J. Kalisch
Titus Professor of Nursing
Chairperson, Parent-Child Nsg.
University of Michigan

Rabbi Peter E. Kasdan
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
Livingston, N.J.

Robert Keim
President
The Advertising Council, Inc.
New York, N.Y.

Misbah Khan, M.D., M.P.H.
Director, Pediatric Primary Care Program
Associate Prof. of Pediatrics
University of Maryland Hosp.

Milling Kinard, Ph.D.
Research Associate
Florence Heller Graduate School
Brandeis University

Shirley Kirschner
Clinical Instructor Social Work
Yale University Child Study Ctr.

Jane Knitzer
Staff Psychologist
Children's Defense Fund
Washington, D.C.

Gary C. Koch
Child Welfare Specialist
Children, Youth & Families Div.
H.E.W.

Jill Korbin
School of Social Work
UCLA

David Kruse
Senior Researcher - Kennedy School
Harvard University

Peter Kuriloff
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania

Kathleen Ladd-Ward
Director Public Relations and Development
Mass. Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children
Boston, MA

Michael E. Lamb
Asst. Prof. of Psych. & Research
Ctr. for Human Growth & Dev.
University of Michigan

Lynn Lamberg
A.M.A. Reporter
Baltimore, MD

Lois Lamont
Special Asst. to Governor
Michigan
Lansing, Michigan

Deborah Lanich
Child Protective Services
Illinois Dept. of Children
& Family Services
Evanston, Illinois

Therese W. Lansburgh
Honorary President
Maryland Committee for Children

Michael Lauderdale, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Director
Institute of Advance Studies
School of Social Work
Univ. of Texas at Austin

Marshall Ledger
Staff Writer
Pennsylvania Gazette

(N) Hanneiore Lehnhoff, M.D.
Psychiatrist
Kings Park, NY

Corinne Levin
Coordinator
The Teacher Center, Inc.
New Haven, CT

(N) Elizabeth W. Levine
North Haven, CT

Mrs. Judith Levy
Philadelphia, PA

Marsha H. Levy-Warren
Program Associate, Children's
Program
The Clark Foundation
New York, N.Y.

Nancy Lick
Supervisor of Planning & Training
Adult Probation Department
Court of Common Pleas
Philadelphia, PA

Leonard L. Lieber
National Administrator
Parents Anonymous
Redondo Beach, CA

Florence Lieberman, D.S.W.
National Assoc. Clinical
Social Work
Hunter College School of
Social Work

(N) Harold I. Lief, M.D.
Professor of Psychiatry
University of Pennsylvania
Director, Marriage Council of
Philadelphia

Frank Loda
Director of Community Pediatrics
North Carolina Memorial Hosp.
Chapel Hill, N.C.

(N) Ira S. Lourie, M.D.
Coordinator of Child Abuse
Programs, NIMH

Barbara J. Lowery
Associate Prof. of Nursing
School of Nursing
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Marcia Lowry
Director, Children's Rights Proj.
New York Civil Liberties Union

Stephen Ludwig
Assistant Prof. of Pediatrics
School of Medicine
University of Pennsylvania

Horton Lustig
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Anthony A. Lyle
Editor
The Pennsylvania Gazette

Annette Lynch, M.D.
Director, Bureau of Children's
Services
Pennsylvania Dept. of Health

(N) Cheryl Macon
Chief, Dept. of Social Serv.
Office of Child Abuse Prevention
(California representative)

(N) Roseann Maiorano
Catholic Youth Organization

Harriet Malick
Associate Professor
Wheelock College

(N) Dr. Dorothy Mandelbaum
Rutgers University

Dr. Seymour J. Mandelbaum
Associate Professor of City &
Regional Planning & History
University of Pennsylvania

Edward Marks
Associate Director
UNICEF, U.N. Secretariat
Internatl. Year of the Child
New York, N.Y.

Anna Marsh
Bush Center at Yale University

Kathy Marshall
Program Administrator
DSS/Public Information & Educ.
(South Dakota representative)
Pierre, S.D.

Anne Martin
Youth Emergency Services
Philadelphia, PA

Donald W. Mathis
Executive Secretary
Commonwealth Child Dev. Comm.
Governor's Office for Human
Resources, Pennsylvania

Helen E. May
Television Editor
New York Post

Ruth Ann Mayer
Vice President
Protect of Lehigh Valley
Lionsville, VA

Dr. Robert B. McCall
Fellow
Center for the Study of Youth
Development
Boystown, Nebraska

Richard McCloskey
Philadelphia, PA

Karen McEvoy
Catholic Youth Organization
Yeaton, PA

Peggy Ann McGarry
Director
Women Against Abuse
Philadelphia, PA

Melzana McMillan
Program Development Specialist
-- Protective Services
Dept. of Public Welfare
Division of Social Services
(Mississippi representative)
Jackson, Miss.

Deanna McRae
Community Involvement Program
Friends Center
Philadelphia, PA

Linda Mellgren
Program Specialist
Office of the Asst. Sec. for
Planning & Evaluation, H.E.W.

Paul Messaris
Assistant Professor
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Karlyn Messinger
Doctoral Candidate
City & Regional Planning
University of Pennsylvania

Victoria Mikow
Teaching Fellow
Bush Center
University of North Carolina

William R. Miller, Ph.D.
Director of Research & Asst. Prof.
School of Medicine
University of Pennsylvania
Marriage Council of Philadelphia

Dr. Patricia Minuchin
Prof. of Psychoeducational Processes
Temple University
Amer. Orthopsychiatric Assoc.

(N) Anthony W. Mitchell
Executive Director
Dept. of Social Services
(Utah representative)

Michael Morgan
Research Assistant
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Peggy Morgan
Reporter
Courier Post
Camden, N.J.

Robin Moulds
Assistant Editor
The Children's Express
New York, N.Y.

George Moushegian
Dean
University of Texas at Dallas
Director
Callier Center

Mrs. Mary Jo Mozingo
Supervisor
Div. of Child Welfare-Soc. Serv.
Indiana State Dept. of Public Welfare - Indianapolis
(Indiana representative)

Susan Muenchow
Bush Center at Yale University

John Mungin
Philadelphia, PA

Kathleen J. Murphy
Congressional Wives Task Force

(N) Marc Nelwirth
United Synagogue Youth
Philadelphia, PA

Karen Nelson
Research Assistant
Bush Center at Yale University

William G. Neville
Director
Divorce Mediation Associates
Atlanta, GA

Carolyn Moore Newberger
Staff Psychologist
Judge Baker Guidance Center
Boston, MA

Eli H. Newberger
Director, Family Dev. Study
Children's Hospital Medical Ctr.
Assistant Prof. of Pediatrics
Harvard Medical School

Helen M. Newton
Associate Editor
TV Guide
Radnor, PA

(N) Mr. Jean Nichols
New York, NY

Jeannie B. Niedermeyer
Program Manager
Family Violence
Law Enforcement Asst. Admin.
Washington, D.C.

Jeffrey Norton
President
Jeffrey Norton Publishers
New York, N.Y.

Donn H. O'Brien
Vice President
Program Practices
CBS/Broadcast Group
New York, N.Y.

Peggy O'Connell
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Dept. of Sociology
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT

Michael O'Farrell
State Supervisor
Child Protective Services
West Virginia Dept. of Welfare
(West Virginia representative)
Charlestown, W.V.

Barbara H. Oliver
Board Member
Day Care & Child Development Council of America, Inc.
Philadelphia, PA

Tim Ombima
Community Involvement Program
Friends Center
Philadelphia, PA

Arielle Orlow
United Synagogue Youth
Philadelphia, PA

Marie M. Oser
Executive Director
Texas Child Care '76, Inc.
Houston, TX

Margaret Osmer
News Network Correspondent
ABC News
Washington, D.C.

Alice Tuohy O'Shea
Defender Child Advocate
Defender Assoc. of Philadelphia

Mindy Padwal
Social Worker
Family Support Center
Yeadon, PA

Marjorie Panitt
Radnor, PA

Merrill Panitt
Editorial Director
TV Guide

(N) Thomas D. Parker
National Institute of Education

Christine B. Pendry
Law Student
Boston College

Shirley Penrod
Office of Human Development
Social Service Section
Louisiana, Baton Rouge

Irene F. Pernsley
Associate Professor
School of Social Work
University of Pennsylvania

Dr. Albert Pepitone
Professor of Psychology
University of Pennsylvania

Debbie Phillips-DeMott
Bush Center at Yale University

Nelda Phillips
Coordinator, Child Protective Serv.
Montgomery County Child Welfare

(N) Dr. John Pierce
Executive Director
PCVCCA

(N) Cynthia A. Pikul
Assistant Editor
Child Protection Report

(N) Ms. Barbara Pomeroy
Executive Director
National Commission on the Internatl. Year of the Child

Allen Potter
Social System Research & Evaluation
Denver Research Institute
University of Denver

Nelson Price
President
Media Action Research Center
New York, N.Y.

Richard Price
Faculty
Bush Center at Univ. of Michigan

Blandina Cardenas Ramirez
Commissioner
Admin. for Children, Youth & Families
Dept. of H.E.W.

Maria Ramirez
Aspira Inc. of Pennsylvania

Suzanne Randolph
Bush Center at Univ. of Michigan

(N) John M. Rector
Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice

Ala M. Reid
Chairman, Child Advocacy Comm.
Association of Junior Leagues
Boston, MA

Victoria Reiss
President
Public Action Coalition for Toys
New York, N.Y.

(N) Alan Reitman
Associate Director
American Civil Liberties Union

R. Linda Resnick
Co-Director
Women in Transition
Philadelphia, PA

Lisa A. Richette
Judge, Court of Common Pleas
First Judicial District of Pennsylvania

Julius B. Richmond
Assistant Secretary for Health
Department of H.E.W.
Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service

(N) Dr. Alyce R. Ritti
State College

Sheren Roach
Project Officer
Maternal & Child Health
Dept. of H.E.W.

Donald Robinson
The Reader's Digest
New York, N.Y.

Lydia Robinson
Philadelphia, PA

(N) Stephen E. Rorke
Executive Director
Natl. Network of Runaway & Youth Services

Matthew Rosenthal
Philadelphia, PA

(N) Thomas M. Roselli
Philadelphia Police Inspector
Juvenile Aid Division

Michael Rosenbluth
B'nai B'rith
Philadelphia, PA

Catherine J. Ross
Postdoctoral Research Associate
Bush Center at Yale University
Research Associate (History)
Yale Univ. Child Study Ctr.

(N) Diane Rotnem, M.S.W.
Social Worker
Yale Child Study Center

Audrey T. Russell
Chairperson
Comm. on Family & Children
Natl. Assn. of Black Social Workers
Philadelphia, PA

Helen Samuels
Doctoral Candidate
Bush Center
University of North Carolina

(N) Elisa Sanchez
Vice Pres. for Special Proj.
Natl. Council of La Raza

(N) Louise Sandler, Ph.D.
President, Clinical Director
Ctr. for Early Childhood Services, Inc.

Ms. Amelia K. Schneider
Administrative Assistant
Dept. of Communication
Ohio State University

Alfred R. Schneider
Vice President
Amer. Broadcasting Companies, Inc.
New York, N.Y.

(N) Daniel Schorr
Washington, D.C.

(N) Lisbeth B. Schorr
Washington, D.C.

Carol J. Schrier, M.W.S., J.D.
Executive Director
Support Ctr. for Child Advocates
Philadelphia, PA

Edward Schumacher
Education Writer
Philadelphia Inquirer

Julius Segal, Ph.D.
Director
Div. Scientific & Public Infor.
NIMH
Washington, D.C.

James Seguin
Producer
Director of Outreach Programs
WQED-TV, Pittsburgh

Toni Seidl-Friedman
Child Abuse Outreach Worker
Children's Hospital - Social Work Dept.

Victoria Seitz
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Bush Center at Yale University

Barbara Settles, Ph.D
Professor
Individual & Family Studies
University of Delaware
National Council on Family Relations
Newark, Delaware

(N) Angela Shaw
Director
Communications Department
NAACP

Robert Lewis Shayon
Professor of Communications
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Eric Sherey
Representative
United Synagogue Youth

Dr. Kathy Sherrod
Acting Director of Demonstration & Research Ctr for Early Educa.
Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee

(N) Phebe Shinn
Film Coordinator
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Louise Schoemaker
Dean
School of Social Work
University of Pennsylvania

Stanley Shepard
Bush Foundation

Myrna B. Shure
Head
Child Development Studies
Hahnemann Medical College

Marsha Siefert
Associate Editor
Journal of Communication
Philadelphia, PA

Heidi Sigal
Program Associate
Foundation for Child Development
New York, N.Y.

Nancy Signorielli
Research Coordinator
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

George A. Silver, M.D.
Professor of Public Health
Yale University

(N) Al Singer
Executive Director
Advocacy Council for the Mentally Ill & Developmentally Disabled

Curtis J. Sitomer
American News Editor
The Christian Science Monitor
Boston, MA

(N) Peter Skerry
Research Assistant
Mediating Structures Project
American Enterprises Institute

(N) Evelyn Slaght
Chief of Professional Services
Social Services Administration

John J. Smey
Assistant Professor
School of Social Work
University of Connecticut

Celeste Simpkins
Research Coordinator
Center for Community Studies
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tenn.

Jeanine Smith
Coordinator for Protective Services, Cook County
Illinois Dept. Children & Family Services
Chicago, Illinois

Albert J. Solnit
Sterling Professor of Pediatrics and Psychiatry and Director
Yale Child Study Center

Janis Somerville
Secretary of Corporation
University of Pennsylvania

Joseph L. Spear
Protective Service & Child Abuse Specialist
Bureau of Child Welfare Programs
Department of Public Welfare
Harrisburg, PA 17120

(N) Nancy S. Spears
International Year of The Child

Merle E. Springer
Deputy Commissioner of Fin. & Soc. Progs.
Texas Dept. of Human Resources
Austin TX

Raymond Starr, Jr.
Associate Prof. of Psychology
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

(N) Brandt F. Steele
Prof. of Psychiatry
Nat'l. Center for Prevention & Treatment of Child Abuse

Frederick Steier
Lecturer
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Eliot Stellar
Provost
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Edward J. Stemmler
Dean
School of Medicine
University of Pennsylvania

Melvin S. Stern, M.D.
Assistant Professor of Pediatrics
University of Maryland Hospital
Baltimore, MD

Geoffrey Stevens
Administrative Director
Social Science Data Center
Philadelphia, PA

Kent Stoneman
Commissioner
Social & Rehabilitation Services
(Vermont representative)
Montpelier, VT

Samuel Streit
Teaching Fellow
Bush Center
University of North Carolina

Joyce Strom
Director
Massachusetts Office for Children
Boston, MA

A. Lenora Taitt, Ed.D.
Program Coordinator
National Commission on the Int'l Year of the Child
New York, N.Y.

Dr. Ruby Takanishi
Bush Center at UCLA

George Thomas, Ph.D.
President
Regional Institute for Social Welfare Research, Inc.
Athens, GA

Margaret Timko
Administrator of Children & Youth Services
Division of Social Services
(Delaware representative)
New Castle, Delaware

Gina Deneen Toppins
Director
Child Abuse Program
Philadelphia, PA

(N) Carol E. Tracy
Director
Penn Women's Center
University of Pennsylvania

Herminio Traviesas
Vice President
Broadcast Standards Policy
National Broadcasting Company, Inc.
New York, N.Y.

Ginn Tucker
Youth Emergency Services
Philadelphia, PA

(N) Thomas Tucker
Regional Program Consultant
Department of HEW

Kathleen Underwood
Manager
Children's Services
(Arkansas representative)
Little Rock, Arkansas

Rena K. Uviller
Director
Juvenile Rights Project
American Civil Liberties Union
New York, N.Y.

Jeanette Valentine
Faculty
Bush Center at Yale University

Fran Vandivier
Chairperson
Child Care Department
Temple University

Dr. John van Zyl
Visiting Scholar
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

(N) Susan van Zyl
Student
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Victor C. Vaughan III, M.D.
Professor of Pediatrics
School of Medicine
Temple University

Crata M. Vaughn
Assistant Director, Counseling
Division of Pupil Personnel & Counseling
Philadelphia, PA

Suzanne Veillieux
Pre-doctoral student
Bush Center at Yale University

Marcia Vogel
Project Director
Foster Grandparent Program
NYC Dept. for the Aging

(N) Adrienne E. Volenik
Staff Attorney
National Center for Youth Law

Teresa Wagner
Project Director
Mentor Program
Juvenile Justice Center of Pa.
Philadelphia, PA

(N) James Walling
Director
Basic Speech Communication Prog.
Central Michigan University

(N) Sharon K. Wallis, Esq.
Chief
Complaint/Domestic Abuse Unit

Joseph Wechsler
Technical Information Office
National Center on Child Abuse & Neglect

Ellen Weintraub
Research Assistant
Bush Center at Yale University

Morton W. Weir
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and
Professor of Psychology
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

Ruth Welles
Crime Prevention Specialist
Department of Public Safety
University of Pennsylvania

Leila Whiting
Project Director, C/A/N
NASW
Washington, D.C.

Connie Whitson
Coordinator
Montgomery Co. Comprehensive
Day Care- Pennsylvania

Tom Wilkinson
Deputy Metropolitan Editor
The Washington Post

Linda L. Willard
Child Protective Service Consultant
State Dept. of Welfare
(Nebraska representative)
Lincoln, Nebraska

Ann Marie Williams, Ph.D.
Research Associate
Marriage Council of Phila.

Dr. Frederick Williams
Dean
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Southern California

Edward Peter Wilson
Director
SCAN Center
University of Pennsylvania

Jane Wilson
Conference Public Relations
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Janet Wilson
Community Involvement Program
Friends Center
Philadelphia, PA

Wendy Wintermute
Pre-doctoral trainee
Bush Center at Univ. of Mich.

Wendy Wolfenson
Graduate Student
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

Janis Yates
Senior Editor
McGraw Hill Book Company
New York, N.Y.

Lynn Yeakel
1st Vice President
Junior League of Philadelphia

James C. Young
Executive Director
Association for Childhood
Education International
Washington, D.C.

Jean C. Young
Chairperson
U.S. National Commission
International Year of the Child
New York, N.Y.

Joslyn Young
Student
Phila. High School for Girls

Madelyn Yucht
Assistant to the Governor
Office of Planning & Policy
(New Jersey representative)

Julie Zatz
Research Associate on Child
Development Research & Public
Policy
National Academy of Sciences
Washington, D.C.

Evette J. Zells
Special Assistant to the Governor
on Children's Affairs
Chicago, Illinois

Edward Zigler
Sterling Professor of Psychology
and Director
Bush Center at Yale University

(N) Indicates person registered but was unable to attend.

Late Registrants

Dr. Clayton Boyer
Phoenix South Community Mental Health Center
Phoenix, Arizona

Janet Dickson
Smithsonian Institute
Washington, D.C.

Dr. John W. Eckman
Rorer Group, Inc.
Fort Washington, PA

Dr. Frederick Frey
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA

Jim Johnston
Bureau of Children's Services
Olympia, Washington

John Meier
Director, Children's Village U.S.A.
Beaumont, CA 92223

Lucia Mouat
The Christian Science Monitor
New York, New York

Barbara Riley
Bureau of Children's Services
Columbus, Ohio

The Honorable Edward Rosenberg
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Inspector Thomas Roselli
Juvenile Aid Division
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Theodore D. Tjossem
Director, Mental Retardation Research Center
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Maryland

Dr. John Weisz
Department of Clinical Psychology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Denise Trower White
National Institute of Child
Health and Human Development
Bethesda, Maryland

Dr. Sumner Root Ziegra
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The attached summary of the child welfare amendments that have been introduced in both houses of Congress is being made available to you since they will promote and facilitate greatly improved services to families and children, which participants at the Philadelphia conference suggested would constitute a major step toward preventing child abuse. The legislation is also designed to reduce the institutionalized abuse of children in the foster care system that conference participants condemned.

New Hope for 500,000 Children: Adrift in the Nation's Foster Care System

Across the country over 500,000 children are drifting from foster home to foster home with little hope that they will ever return to their biological parents or find a permanent home through adoption.

Since 1961, the number of children in foster family care has more than tripled, although the total child population has increased only 3% in the same period. Federal, state and local agencies are deeply concerned because the nation's child welfare system can no longer cope with this mounting problem.

But now legislation proposed by the administration can help the states improve their services for children and families and give new hope to many children adrift in the foster care system.

The administration's child welfare amendments, recently proposed to Congress, would provide for substantially increased federal funding to the states to assist them in strengthening their programs for children in foster family care and also for children and youth who are dependent, neglected, abused or abandoned. This legislation is currently being considered in the House by the Ways and Means Committee and in the Senate by the Finance Committee, especially in the Subcommittee on Public Assistance chaired by Senator Moynihan.

The year 1979 could be a milestone year for the nation's children if Congress enacts the proposed child welfare amendment. Here's what the legislation would provide:

- an increase in federal child welfare funds for the states from $56.5 million in 1979 to $141 million in 1980 and $266 million in 1981

- specific requirements that the states must meet to obtain these funds--requirements that would improve planning for children in foster care and protect the rights of the children, and their biological and foster parents

- for the first time federal funds would be available to the states that would permit them to pay adoption subsidies to families who adopt eligible "special needs" children--youngsters who are older, have physical or mental handicaps, belong to a minority race, or are members of a sibling group

- encouragement of preventive and support services to help parents who cannot meet the physical and emotional needs of their children because of financial or other serious problems

The administration's child welfare amendment would help the states, through increased fundings, to improve the quality and scope of their services for children in foster family care and other children in need.

For years, the growing number of children requiring placements in foster family homes has all but overwhelmed states and local social service agencies. These agencies had wanted to help children in foster care, but they have been thwarted by limited resources, insufficient staff, and untrained and overworked social workers who are only able to react to crises situations.

The extent of the problem was shown by a recent national study conducted by the Children's Bureau of HEW's Administration for Children, Youth and Families. This survey revealed that:

- more than half of the children in foster family care have been separated from their families for more than two years--about 100,000 for more than six years

- nearly 1/4 of the children have been in three or more foster family homes

- nearly 1/2 the children who have spent two or more years in foster care have had at least four different social workers

- more than 100,000 have been awaiting adoption for some time, and for over 1/3 of these children, financial assistance will be needed to meet their special needs

- 50,000 children in foster care are legally free for adoption, but adoptive homes cannot be found for them

Of course, passage of the new legislation proposed by the administration would not solve overnight all the complex problems that bring families into the child welfare system. But these child welfare amendments would go a long way toward reducing the number of children separated from their families in foster care, increasing the number of youngsters moved out of foster care back to their families, and raising the number of homeless children placed for adoption.

When you think of the many children who need loving, caring homes--of the many families who need help staying together--it is clear that state and local child welfare agencies need all the support they can get from federal government and from the public too!

This summary information has been made available by the Administration for Children, Youth and Families.

Vol. 44—No. 48
3-9-79

BOOK 2:
PAGES
13253-13434

federal register

BOOK 2 OF 2 BOOKS
FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1979
PART VI

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Human Development Services

Administration for Children, Youth and Families

■

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT GRANT PROGRAM PRIORITIES—FISCAL YEARS 1979 AND 1980

Research, Demonstration and Service Improvement Grants

[4110-92-M]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Human Development Services, Administration for Children, Youth and Families

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT GRANT PROGRAM PRIORITIES—FISCAL YEAR 1979 AND 1980

Research, Demonstration and Service Improvement Grants

AGENCY: Office of Human Development Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ACTION: Notice of proposed Fiscal Year(s) 1979 and/or 1980 Child Abuse and Neglect Research, Demonstration and Service Improvement priorities.

SUMMARY: This notice states the research, demonstration and service improvement (R, D, & S) priorities that the Children's Bureau's National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect proposes to initiate in Fiscal Year 1979 and/or 1980, depending on the availability of funds, under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (Pub. L. 93-247, as amended). This notice is being published in order that the final R, D, & S priorities may incorporate and reflect the expertise of individuals knowledgeable in the field.

DATE: In order to be considered, comments must be received no later than May 8, 1979. Comments on these proposed priorities or suggestions for other priorities are invited. *No proposals, concept papers or other forms of application should be submitted at this time.*

ADDRESS: Comments should be sent to: Associate Chief, Children's Bureau, P.O. Box 1182, Washington, D.C. 20013.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, Children's Bureau/ACYF, P.O. Box 1182, Washington, D.C., (202) 755-0593.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This statement announces the proposed R, D, & S priorities to be funded in Fiscal Year 1979 and/or 1980, depending on the availability of funds, under the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. Public review of these proposed priorities is being sought, as required by Pub. L. 93-247, as amended, in order to draw upon the experience, expertise and most advanced thinking of persons in the field and to maximize the potential benefits of the child abuse and neglect research, demonstration and service program.

The Children's Bureau's National Center on Child Abuse (CB/NCCAN) conducts activities designed to assist and enhance national, state, community, and citizen efforts to prevent, identify, and treat child abuse and neglect. The activities include: conducting research and demonstrations; supporting service improvement projects; providing technical assistance; gathering, analyzing and disseminating information and data on research and programs through a clearinghouse, providing grants to eligible States for strengthening and improving their child abuse and neglect programs; and coordinating Federal activities in child abuse and neglect with those of other Federal agencies, through the Federal Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect. Thus, there are many activities other than research, demonstration and service which require staff and financial support by CB/NCCAN.

Previous and current CB/NCCAN research, demonstration and service activities have focused primarily on improving the identification and treatment of child abuse and neglect by parental caretakers and increasing the involvement of community-based human service agencies in child protection. The proposed priorities indicate a specific program emphasis in FY 1979 and FY 1980 on protection for children in residential institutions, primary and secondary prevention of child abuse and neglect, and the treatment of child sexual abuse. *Residential institutions* are here defined to include residential treatment centers, temporary and long-term shelters, detention centers and homes, centers for the mentally retarded and developmentally disabled, and foster care institutions and homes. *Primary prevention* is here defined to include efforts to provide the necessary educational and social services needed by families in order to make it possible for them to manage their child-rearing responsibilities adequately and to reduce the likelihood of child abuse and neglect. *Secondary prevention* is here defined to include efforts to encourage families that are "at risk" of child abuse or child neglect, but have not yet been actually abusive or neglectful to their children, to take self-initiated action to get help to solve their child rearing problems. *Child sexual abuse* is here defined to include contacts or interactions between a child and an adult in which the child is being used for the sexual stimulation or gratification of the perpetrator or another person.

The proposed priority to support research on the needs and resources for child protection in residential institutions is based on the premise that specific analysis is needed to effectively translate the requirements of Federal and State law and regulation regarding the prevention, identification, reporting, independent investigation and correction of child maltreatment in residential institutions into practical procedures.

The proposed priority to support primary prevention is based on the premise that State and community organizations can mobilize existing agency resources to bring about specific changes in health, social service, educational or mental health services that will more adequately equip parents for their child-nurturing roles.

The proposed priority to support secondary prevention is based on the premise that public Child Protective Services (CPS) at the local level can incorporate innovations already successfully demonstrated by nonpublic agencies which will encourage and support parents to seek help in "at risk" situations and will implement ways of providing such help on a voluntary basis.

The proposed priority on training in the treatment of child sexual abuse reflects an increase in identified and reported cases of intrafamily child sexual abuse in this country, the small number of professionals trained to provide appropriate treatment for victims, perpetrators and families in child sexual abuse cases, and the legislative mandate contained in Pub. L. 93-247, as amended (Section 5).

The priority projects described below are planned for funding in Fiscal Year 1979 and/or Fiscal Year 1980, depending on the availability of funds, for an initial budgetary period of fifteen months including a three-month start-up period. Continuation funding for these projects is planned either through Fiscal Year 1981 or 1982. Total project periods will be either two and one-quarter or three and one-quarter years.

Specific comments and suggestions are solicited concerning each of the priorities described below. In addition, reviewers are invited to suggest any additional research, demonstration or service priorities. Suggested additional priorities will be most helpful if they are presented in the same format and with the same topical areas as the priorities described in this announcement. *No proposals, concept papers, or other forms of application should be submitted at this time.* Any such submissions will be discarded. In order to maintain a procedure fair to everyone, applications will be accepted only in response to the final Program Announcements to be published at a later date in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

No acknowledgement will be made of the comments received, but all of them will be considered in finalizing the child abuse and neglect research, demonstration and service improvement priorities. In addition, all per-

sons commenting on the proposed priorities will be placed on the Child Abuse and Neglect mailing list and will be sent the final research, demonstration and service improvement Program Announcements which will serve as the invitation for grant applications. It is anticipated that the Program announcements will be published in the Spring of 1979 and grants awarded in Fall, 1979, subject to Departmental approvals and the availability of funds.

PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

(1) PROJECT TITLE: RESEARCH ON THE NEEDS AND RESOURCES FOR CHILD PROTECTION IN RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONS

Number, Cost and Duration

Approximately three grants will be awarded for total project periods of two and one-fourth years each. The initial award and subsequent noncompeting continuation award will be funded at a level of $75,000 each.

Importance and Purpose

Very little is known about the actual extent or the exact nature of institutional abuse and neglect in the United States. To a large degree, this is so because the administrative, regulatory and proprietarial systems which have charge of such institutions do not lend themselves to public monitoring. There is only meager data on the nature, incidence and severity of such maltreatment in residential institutions, and there are no definitive statistics. Yet, there is compelling public responsibility for the public safety and protection of children in institutions.

While the CB/NCCAN does not have legal or regulatory responsibility for residential institutions, it does have responsibilities to provide leadership, technical assistance and information that will improve child protection in such settings. Most institutions are State or privately operated under existing State and local laws and regulations. State and local legislative bodies and regulatory agencies determine and implement enforcement of child abuse and neglect laws and child protection measures governing their operation. However, there is a need for more practical experience or knowledge that States and private operators can look to in formulating and implementing child protective services in residential institutions.

These projects will define, through field research, various approaches to the development and implementation of appropriate policies, regulations and administrative procedures which will support effective prevention, identification, investigation and corrective action of child abuse and neglect in institutional settings.

Background

Approximately 1% of the child population of the United States, or about 754,000 children, are in some form of residential or foster family care. While the number seems relatively small, the public responsibility for these children is great. In many cases, these children are in institutional care because society, acting through public agencies, has determined that their care and nurture cannot be provided by their families and has intervened to provide it in place of families. In other cases, these children are in institutional care because their families have recognized their inability to cope with special physical or emotional handicaps and have chosen or been forced by these circumstances to seek alternative ways to care for their children. In any event, there is strong public responsibility for the adequate safety and protection of children in institutions.

As part of the eligibility for State grants, required by Pub. L. 93-247, as amended, each State must provide for the reporting of known or suspected incidents of child abuse and neglect in such a way that the legally authorized investigative agency may not be made responsible for investigating itself if it also happens to be responsible for running residential programs for children.

In Fiscal Year 1978, a total of 47 States had attained full or conditional eligibility for State grants. It is expected that the number will reach 50 during Fiscal Year 1979. To meet the eligibility requirements as they affect institutional child maltreatment, States have vested investigative authority in various agencies.

In September, 1978, the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect awarded four demonstration grants on the "Investigation and Correction of Child Abuse and Neglect in Residential Institutions." Eligibility for these grants was limited to State agencies with legal authority to make investigations and take corrective action. The grantees are the Utah Division of Family Services, the Massachusetts Office for Children, The District of Columbia Social Rehabilitation Administration, and the New Jersey Division of Youth and Family Services.

The Utah project has contracted with the Department of Special Education of Utah State University to serve as the organizer and sponsor of a team to develop and validate a system for reporting known and suspected cases of institutional abuse or neglect, to act as the State's independent investigative authority and to recommend corrective action.

The Massachusetts project will create substate regional visitation-review committees and a statewide task force to address primary prevention issues, refine licensing and standard setting functions for residential placements of children, and refine the mechanisms worked out with the State Department of Welfare for receiving reports and investigating and correcting individual cases.

The District of Columbia project will initiate a system for allowing residents to report maltreatment by signing their names to a form and depositing it directly into locked boxes which will be checked daily. These reports, together with staff-initiated "unusual incident reports," will begin an investigative and corrective process that will involve independent investigators, a review panel which will include residents and outside advocates and will make recommendations to the Administrator of the Social Rehabilitation Administration. In addition, the project will provide Advance Counseling Groups for staff on alternative means of dealing with staff-child confrontations and discipline.

New Jersey's project will examine and test three different approaches to advocacy and procedures using internal, State administered and private citizen advocacy systems of investigation. It will also make a major effort at raising awareness of institutional employees of their responsibility to report known and suspected cases of child maltreatment.

Expected Findings

These projects are designed to generate knowledge about the nature, scope, and severity of residential child maltreatment and to analyze and define appropriate alternative approaches for protecting children in residential institutions against abuse or neglect. The hypothesis underlying these projects is that, with better definition and analysis of the dimensions of the problem, the inferred need for institutional child protective measures can be directly addressed. The results of these projects will be definitions of protective service requirements, model approaches and recommended policies, protocols, procedures and materials that can be used by the States in implementing on-going systems to provide child protection in residential institutions.

Methodology

Approximately three grants will be awarded to agencies or organizations with field research capability and with the appropriate access to institutions proposed as the source of research information. Among the approaches that these projects may choose are: (1) Collaboration with the four demonstration projects described in the Background section above in order to analyze, synthesize and develop guidelines from their experiences; (2) investigative studies in institutional settings of factors contributing to incidence of child maltreatment; (3) "state

of the art" studies to identify existing or planned residential protective services systems; (4) analysis of policy and procedural requirements for providing residential protective services; and (5) feasibility studies for collecting and analyzing data on the incidence of child maltreatment in residential institutions.

Utilization

The findings of these projects will be directly disseminated to State Child Protective Service agencies, other relevant State and Federal agencies and decisionmakers, and private and quasi-public advocacy organizations (such as State Committees for Children and Youth). Findings will also be reviewed by the Federal Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect and be used there to inform future research, demonstration and service-improvement planning.

(2) PROJECT TITLE: DEMONSTRATIONS OF STATE AND COMMUNITY ACTION TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Number, Cost and Duration

Approximately 12 grants will be awarded for total project periods of three and one-fourth years each. The initial award and subsequent noncompeting continuation awards will be funded at a level of $50,000 each.

Importance and Purpose

Through these grants, CB/NCCAN will test the assumption that existing service systems can be mobilized to provide family supportive services to prevent child abuse and neglect and that organized, ongoing and efficient approaches can be developed and thus transform primary prevention efforts from rhetoric to action. The larger and encompassing policy question which will be examined is whether or not, and by whom and in what manner, can small amounts of money be used to effect and augment needed planning and utilization of primary prevention activities. Eligible recipients of such financial support to undertake prevention efforts will be State and local public and private nonprofit agencies or organizations and minority private nonprofit organizations (including Black, Native American, Hispanic and other cultural minority populations and migrant farmworkers.

Background

In the recent past, there has been a heavy emphasis on programs and projects which focus on the treatment of child abuse and neglect (i.e., services to decrease or eliminate the possibility of recurrence of child abuse and neglect). A variety of techniques for supporting and treating abusive and neglectful parents, ranging from psychiatric consultation to lay therapy, and surrogate parenting to participation in self-help groups (such as Parents Anonymous) have been tested and often proven successful.

By definition, primary prevention can be considered to encompass the bulk of supportive, stress-reducing community services and can include many existing primary prevention activities. Services such as those offered by school systems with breakfast and lunch programs, community-based family planning services and prenatal care through health clinics, to name a few, are well known.

Primary prevention efforts have been lauded by professionals and paraprofessionals in those fields which most often are involved in child abuse and neglect concerns (such as child protective service workers, medical and health personnel, law enforcement officials and educators). Yet, many of these groups of involved professionals and paraprofessionals working within taditional state and local human service programs explain that their mandated work tasks are too often crisis-oriented and allow no time for involvement in needed prevention services.

Moreover, many of the traditional primary prevention services are insufficient and are rarely part of a well thought out system to prevent the most severe forms of parent-child dysfunctioning—child abuse and neglect. Many of the newly tested primary prevention services, such as parent education and coping classes, are not utilized extensively. In addition, there are new primary prevention plans which are being conceptualized but have not yet been tested.

To date, there has been no widespread, structured commitment and funding for primary prevention activities by agencies and organizations at the state and local level. There exists within planning and advocacy units for children and families and within a number of other agencies, a great potential to set in place a structure through which planning, organizing and overseeing state or local primary prevention efforts can be accomplished. The structure could be, for example, a comprehensive plan to assure the availability of a number of needed primary prevention services in a state or locality; or a design to alter those state procedures most amendable to change, which will allow for and facilitate primary prevention activities.

Minority organizations, as well, should have a major role in the development and testing of primary prevention structures. Indeed, minority organizations, representing large economically disadvantaged populations, are acutely aware of the difficulties of raising children and maintaining

family organization when unsafe and otherwise unfit housing, a scarcity of food and money are pervasive problems.

Expected Findings

CB/NCCAN expects to identify approaches to child abuse and neglect prevention that appear to be particularly promising for further development and widespread implementation.

Methodology

Approximately twelve projects will be funded to demonstrate how social and institutional forces can be enlisted to prevent child maltreatment before it occurs. Through grants to approximately six State agencies or organizations, three metropolitan area public or private agencies or organizations and three minority organizations, this primary prevention effort will seek to: (1) Strengthen those societal forces which can prevent child abuse and neglect, and (2) lessen or counteract those societal forces which can lead families to abuse or neglect their children. These projects are expected to demonstrate *practical* approaches to prevention such as: encouraging/requiring hospitals to provide pre- and post-natal counseling for parents; instituting family education and supportive social services in public schools; providing parent/family education and courses on child rearing skills for adults through public schools and community education; strengthening informal helping networks through the improvement of Information and Referral services; and mounting public education on family support resources through the public media.

Utilization

Information on how to devise systems for assuring primary prevention services is clearly needed at the state and local level. The exploration of this question can provide, on the one hand, models of how such systems can be best developed and, on the other hand, insight into specific areas and processes for further development.

(3) PROJECT TITLE: COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH STUDY OF STATE AND COMMUNITY ACTION TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Number, Cost and Duration of Project

One grant will be awarded for a total project period of three and one-fourth years. The initial award and subsequent noncompeting continuation awards will be funded at a level of $100,000.

Importance and Purpose of the Project

Through this grant, CB/NCCAN will support a collaborative analysis of the approaches and implementation of the Demonstration of State and Community Action to Prevent Child Abuse and Neglect. The project will serve as the focal point for a collaborative effort undertaken with the demonstration projects to collect and analyze information on how primary prevention can be made part of the programs of existing service systems and what are the most promising programmatic avenues for effecting preventive results. Thus, the project will be the principal vehicle for utilization and dissemination of the demonstration findings to other State and community organizations and agencies capable of replicating their successful programs.

Background

[See same section under (2) above]

Expected Findings

[See same section under (2) above]

Methodology

The project will establish a collaborative relationship with the (approximately) 12 Demonstration projects of State and Community Action to Prevent Child Abuse and Neglect. It will serve as a central coordinator to: (1) Analyze each project's plans; (2) design a research framework for analyzing the processes of projects' implementation; (3) develop data collection instruments for addressing process issues; (4) analyze the data; and (5) prepare a descriptive and analytical report on cross-project findings. The project will meet with the demonstration project directors on a semiannual basis, make annual site visits and receive project progress reports on a quarterly basis as a means of gathering data and insuring effective collaboration with the demonstration projects.

Utilization

[See same section under (2) above]

(4) PROJECT TITLE: CHILD PROTECTION AGENCY MANAGEMENT OF PARENTAL SELF-REFERRALS

Number, Cost and Duration

Approximately 8 grants will be awarded for total project periods of two and one-fourth years each. The initial award and subsequent noncompeting continuation awards will be funded at a level of $40,000 to $60,000 each.

Importance and Purpose

Public child protection agencies need to implement effective ways of handling self-referrals, as well as the opportunity and the incentive to make their services, and those of their community, responsive to the needs of voluntary clients.

These projects will seek to improve the effectiveness of child protection agencies through the development of

systems for the receipt, assessment, case management and treatment of self-referrals which are responsive to the needs and special concerns of voluntary clients. In addition, procedures for establishing accountability for voluntary, private treatment of identified abuse and neglect cases and referral of high-risk cases to sources outside the formal child protection system will be developed. Efforts will be aimed at the development of a comprehensive service network from in-take to followup which will provide compassionate, fair and voluntary services to self-referred families.

Background

Increased public awareness concerning the availability of treatment for child abusing and neglecting families has increased the rate of self-referrals in recent years. According to American Humane Association 1976 statistics of reported cases from 31 States, approximately 7% (or 6,700) of the cases reported to public child protection agencies fall into the category of self-referral. An even greater number of self-referrals from families whose problems include actual or potential child maltreatment are received by private family service agencies each year.

Based on the experience of the joint demonstration projects, the CB/NCCAN Treatment and Innovative projects, and Parents Anonymous, we know that programs can maximize the number of families voluntarily requesting assistance, increase early intervention efforts and improve treatment prognosis by tailoring the type and management of services to fit the needs of self-referred clients. For example, self-referrals constituted 60% of the caseload of the Family Stress Center in San Diego, which emphasized the voluntary aspects of prevention and treatment in a nonthreatening atmosphere. The community-based prevention and treatment projects funded in FY 1978 have carried this concern further by instituting a variety of self-referral programs in non-Child Protective Service settings.

Methodology

The grants will be awarded to State, multicounty, county or local public child protection agencies. An effort will be made to fund projects in demographically and culturally diverse settings. Each project will be required to document the cooperation of the appropriate community prevention and treatment referral resources. (Projects may enter into contractural relationships with private agencies to provide intake and treatment services.)

Each project will also be required to develop a system for: (1) Improved and supportive handling of self-referrals which are received by the mandated child protection agency, and (2) coordination and joint management of self-referrals which are received by other agencies or professionals in the community. Methods for improving internal management of self-referrals could involve: specialized intake and investigation procedures, policies which minimize intrusion on family life and support individual rights of self-determination, increased availability of prevention and outreach services, provision of supportive services (such as group treatment and parent aides) which maximize clients' willingness to share their problems, and improved community referral systems to resources which are most appropriate for voluntary clients. Methods for improving coordination of self-referrals received by community agencies could include: guidelines for appropriate handling of reports to child protection agencies of self-referred cases, provisions for waiving formal child protection agency investigations in selected cases, contracts of cooperation between child protection agencies and community service agencies, and monitoring systems for maintaining treatment accountability for voluntary clients.

Utilization

The information gained and the program components developed will be communicated to the more than 3,000 public child protection agencies across the country. It is expected that reporting and referral guidelines, model contracts of interagency cooperation, and specialized procedures for the management and treatment of voluntary clients, will be utilized by CPS agencies to restructure improved community coordination and handling of self-referrals.

(5) PROJECT TITLE: CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE TREATMENT TRAINING INSTITUTE

Number, Cost and Duration

Approximately one grant will be awarded for a total project period of three and one-fourth years. The initial award will be approximately $100,000. Noncompeting continuation awards will be funded at a level of $300,000.

Importance and Purpose

The proposed project addresses the problem of providing quality professional training on the treatment of incest and child sexual abuse in settings where therapeutic interventions can be effectively demonstrated.

Background

While it is generally agreed that ordinary instructional programs or workshops are not sufficient to provide the kind of treatment skills or level of understanding necessary to work with incestuous families, existing specialized treatment programs do not have ade-

quate staff or resources needed to develop comprehensive, in-service training components. Recognizing this, Congress amended Pub. L. 93-247 to provide support for the provision of personnel training in the area of child sexual abuse. The purpose of the proposed project is to test the feasibility, lay the groundwork and develop the methodology for the full implementation of training/treatment centers on a regional basis. It will address such questions as: Number of personnel that can be trained per year; effectiveness of various training methods; number of staff and clients needed to maintain training components; and cost-effectiveness of various methods.

Expected Findings

Primary questions to be addressed by the proposed training/treatment projects are:

- What are the best means of transferring clinical skills and knowledge within a treatment setting?
- What are the most effective, replicable training techniques for dealing with a sensitive and difficult subject such as incest?
- What is the maximum number of professionals that can be trained at one time, and what is the minimum length of time necessary for an effective training program?
- What combination of staff/client/trainee ratios are conducive to the success of an in-service training program?
- What types of replicable training/treatment models are most cost-effective in terms of numbers served and quality of training experience?

As a secondary benefit, we expect these projects to continue refining clinical treatment methods.

Methodology

One pilot project will be established for the purpose of planning, developing, and implementing the groundwork for comprehensive institutes on the training and treatment of child sexual abuse. The proposed demonstration project will develop and refine the specific approaches and methodologies that are most applicable and cost-effective for future training/treatment efforts. Activities will include, but are not to be limited to: in-service programs for the training of personnel involved in the treatment of child sexual abuse; refinement of specific therapeutic treatment techniques; technical assistance in the area of case consultation; and the development of resource and training materials for use by other child protection and family treatment programs.

Because the proposed project will be focused primarily on in-service training (requiring actual therapeutic involvement with client families), potential grantees must be ongoing, child sexual abuse treatment programs of demonstrated effectiveness in order to be eligible for funding. In addition, their services must be related to public child protection agencies in order to insure that necessary linkages and institutionalization of the programs are maintained. The methodology for in-service training programs will include the provision for training community teams of professionals who function as treatment supervisors or lead therapists in their own service settings. Written support of their agencies to implement treatment programs will be required. Training will consist of intensive, in-service clinical experiences at the grantee agency, supplemented by course work, training seminars, and structured supervision of assigned caseloads. Initial in-service training programs could be followed up by advanced programs several months later.

While the proposed project will act as a forerunner or small scale model of the larger, comprehensive training/treatment centers described in Pub. L. 93-247, as amended, its primary purpose will be to refine the strategies and methodology of undertaking a major in-service training/treatment approach to staff development and skill building on a national basis.

Utilization

The proposed project is intended to develop the framework, demonstrate feasible methodologies, and serve as a model for a comprehensive approach to in-service training which is, thus far, relatively untested in the field of child protection. The findings and techniques developed by this short-term demonstration will be used in preparing the guidelines for future staff development efforts in the area of sexual abuse and professional training in the treatment of other forms of child abuse and neglect. In addition, it will develop a cadre of training/treatment centers with the experience, expertise, and potential ability to implement training programs on a national/regional basis without the need for lengthy start-up periods.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number: 13.628—Child Development—Child Abuse)

Dated: February 27, 1979.

BLANDINA CÁRDINAS RAMIREZ,
Commissioner for Children, Youth and Families.

Approved: March 5, 1979.

ARABELLA MARTINEZ,
Assistant Secretary for Human Development Services.

[FR Doc. 79-7060 Filed 3-8-79; 8:45 am]

would you like to know

if any changes have been made in certain titles of the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS without reading the Federal Register every day? If so, you may wish to subscribe to the LSA (List of CFR Sections Affected), the "Federal Register Index," or both.

LSA (List of CFR Sections Affected)
$10.00
per year

The LSA (List of CFR Sections Affected) is designed to lead users of the Code of Federal Regulations to amendatory actions published in the Federal Register, and is issued monthly in cumulative form. Entries indicate the nature of the changes.

Federal Register Index $8.00
per year

Indexes covering the contents of the daily Federal Register are issued monthly, quarterly, and annually. Entries are carried primarily under the names of the issuing agencies. Significant subjects are carried as cross-references.

A finding aid is included in each publication which lists Federal Register page numbers with the date of publication in the Federal Register.

Note to FR Subscribers: FR Indexes and the LSA (List of CFR Sections Affected) will continue to be mailed free of charge to regular FR subscribers.

Mail order form to:
Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

There is enclosed $_____ for _____ subscription(s) to the publications checked below:

..... **LSA (LIST OF CFR SECTIONS AFFECTED) ($10.00 a year domestic; $12.50 foreign)**

FEDERAL REGISTER INDEX ($8.00 a year domestic; $10.00 foreign)

Name _____

Street Address _____

City _____ **State** _____ **ZIP** _____

Make check payable to the Superintendent of Documents